NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

10c

Royal Oak, Michigan | September 1, 1941 | Subscription: Three Dollars Per Year

AN ANSWER TO JUSTICE MURPHY

(See Page 7)

Read 'We Predict' on Page 3—

Fall of Churchill, National Socialist Party in the U.S.A.

Not an Oil Shortage, British Using Tankers

(Story on Page 10)

An Answer to the Critics of Archbishop Beckman

COMMENT ON WORLD EVENTS ★ BANKRUPTCY SURE, WARNING OF ROOSEVELT ★ DETROIT STREET CAR STRIKE

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dinner Chat

They Also Serve Who Ring the Bell

A RECENT week-end found this department attending Holy Mass at old St. Vincent de Paul's — Father E. G. Werling's church — at Elkhart, Indiana.

It was Holy Name Sunday and the parish breakfast after Mass was in the nature of a tribute to the "silver jubilee" of the church janitor. The pastor's tribute to a devoted servant was food for fruitful meditation.

Twenty-five years of faithful service as a church sexton! That means 25 years at the bell rope, tolling the *Angelus* three times every day — at 6 a. m., at noon, and in the evening.

For 25 years, he had "tipped the old bells over" as another procession of First Communicants marched up the aisle.

For 25 years, he had rung the joyous wedding chimes for happy young couples entering upon the holy state of matrimony.

For 25 years, he had tolled the *Sanctus* bell for funerals of the faithful departed. A quiet, self-effacing little man in the back of the crowd, he had bade farewell to another parishoner as the casket was wheeled from the church. For — humanly enough — a church janitor takes a personal interest in his charges.

Elkhart, Indiana, is — or was — a railroad town; it thinks by the timetable. So one can picture the janitor at old St. Vincent's taking pride in his punctuality — not five minutes late, or a few minutes early, but ringing the Catholic *Angelus* "on the dot," so that all within hearing of the blessed tones might set their clocks by it.

Spring and Autumn, Summer and Winter, sleepy Catholics — and others — hearing the call of the 6 a. m. *Angelus* bell in the darkness of a Winter morning, and turning over for another quick nap, betimes, just may have given a thought, now and then, to the man at the bell rope.

Twenty-five years of continuous service is longer than any priest or curate now serving the old church has been there.

The Gospel of the Sunday, appropriately, was the familiar lesson in humility — the Pharisee with his boastful prayer, and the Publican, "standing afar off, who would not so much as lift up his eyes to God," but struck his breast saying, "Lord, be merciful."

The front pews of the church, as doubtless the breakfast tables afterwards, were filled with humble and saintly men, old heads, greying and bald. There were not many young men at Holy Name Mass that Sunday morning.

"Calling all young men! Calling all young men! Calling all young men!" The pastor's voice rang out in the old church in stirring tones that belied his white hairs.

"Christ in the Blessed Sacrament calls in vain," he said. "Your Government calls all young men — to send them off to camps and make them mad for killing other men. Men do not hate each other enough to kill; they must first be made mad men!

"Give me a thousand young men, and I will lick the world — *if they are Christians!*"

Scribner's Commentator

SOCIAL JUSTICE National Magazine can sympathize with our contemporary, *Scribner's Commentator,* in its recent newsstand "persecution."

When he founded SOCIAL JUSTICE in 1936, Father Coughlin announced that this paper would not be sold on newsstands. While the zeal and enterprise of some resourceful distributors has placed the magazine on a thousand or more independent stands, the magazine is still, in the main, obtainable chiefly through subscription or distribution by individual dealers.

In their September number, *Scribner's Commentator* announces:

"Newsstand Farewell.

"Last month most of America's Warbugs had a good laugh up their sleeves when they learned that we had taken *Scribner's Commentator* off the newsstands and that henceforth the magazine would be available by subscription only.

"For many months we had put up with a *dealer-sabotage* which was as costly as it was annoying and determined as of July 10th to have no more of it. Now it is our turn to enjoy a chuckle or two.

"New subscriptions and renewals have, over the past month, set an all time high. The big Warbugs were able to influence thousands of little Warbug magazine dealers to cheat us out of sales, *but they haven't as yet gotten to the American hearthside!*"

Pete Thinks People Have a Lot of Trouble

HELLO FOLKS:

Well, it's a good thing I've got four good legs under me these days t' get me t' work on my own power 'n that I don't hafta depend on th' bus 'r streetkar kompny t' get me t' th' offus. Right now they're busy havin' a lotta fun havin' a strike. It must be a lotta fun 'cause they seem t' hafta have one ev'ry once in a while—like a piknic 'r somethin'.

It seems kinda funny selebratin' Labor Day these days when it seems that th' reezun f'r havin' a speshul day set aside t' honor labor 'n th' laborin' man is lost in a maze uv fights 'n sqwabuls not over labor 'r th' lack uv it but over who's gonna be boss.

Sometimes I'm glad I'm just a Great Dane. Peepul seem t' have such a lotta trubbul!

Peepul do funny things, don't they? I hafta smile sometimes at 'em 'n what they do. They don't seem t' be happy unless they're in a mess — leestwise that's how it looks t' me on akkount uv they seem t' go outta their way t' get inta 'em. No one'll give a inch f'r peace. Nope, that'd never do — both hafta be what's kalled bull-heddud 'n so th' fight goes on 'n on.

I hope f'r th' sake uv all th' innosunt peepul who're bein' inkonvenyunsed by this local strike that it's soon settuld. It must be awful embarrassin' t' hafta stand on a korner 'n hope sum kind persun'll play th' role uv th' Good Sumarutn 'n give y' a lift. Poor Elsie—she's one uv our girls—ses she feels just terruble standin' on th' korner thumin' her way home, but that's jus' 'bout all she c'n do. She lives so far from work 'n can't be takin' a taxi 'r she'd have nothin left t' live on.

' ' '

I s'pose by th' time y' reed this this pertikular lokal strike'll be settuld either by th' C.I.O. 'r th' A. F. of L.—boy I'm gettin' so I c'n rattul off th' 'nishuls just like one-two-three.

Y're just outta luk in this modern day 'n age if y' can't, aren't y'? What with th' New Deal settin' up so menny agunsies with great, long names there was nothin' else t' do but start shortenin' 'em up in this way otherwise no work c'd get done. Y'd spend haf th' day tellin' somebuddy's stenog who y' wanted t' speek t' in th' departmunt in charge uv how t' train flees 'n on what dog they will thrive best.

I'll bet th' guvernmunt offishuls from th' Presadunt down c'd keep their waistlines down 'n keep th' guvernmuntal departmunts fresh in mind jus' by doin' their settin' up exersizus 'r bendin' down exersizus —whichever they prefer like this — "NRA — down — AAA — up — CCC — down — FHA — up — FBI — bend — RFC—stretch — OPM left — NYA — right — WPA — kick — PWA — swing — SEC — inhale — TVA — exhale — AEF — STOP. Enuf! This c'd go on 'n on 'n on—but that's just how it is, isnt' it?

' ' '

While I c'n still move—I'd better get on my way PDQ 'r DLD (Dead-Line Daddy) 'll be after me f'r bein' so silly.

I know I should menshun SUBS once in a while, but I kinda got off on th' silly foot this mornin' 'n can't get off uv it long enuf t' settul down t' biznuss. I know y' know we need subskripshuns, folks, 'n I don't like t' be askin' y' f'r help all th 'time 'speshully when y've been so good 'bout sendin' 'em in. But 's long's I'm sirkulashun manajer I s'pose I c'n ask y' to notuce th' littul blank below here that needs fillin' in a bit. I don't like that blank 'spresshun on its face, do you? Looks kinda lonesum, too. I wuddn't be a bit s'prized if it wants t' be dressed up a bit 'n sent back home here where it belongs. How 'bout bein' th' Good Sumarutn 'n helpin' it out?

Well, s'long f'r now. See y' later.

—Pete.

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.

Just living annual wage.

Nationalization of important public resources.

Private ownership of all other property.

Control of private property for public good.

Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank.

Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.

Cost of living maintained on an even keel.

Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.

Labor's right to organize.

Recall of non-productive bonds.

Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.

Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.

Simplification of Government and lower taxes.

Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war

Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE National Weekly, Copyrighted 1941 by the Social Justice Publishing Company, publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 179, E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Vol. 8 September 1, 1941 No. 9

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Date_____

Name _____

Address_____ City_____

State_____ Subscription rate $3 a year. Renewal ☐ New ☐

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

We Predict

HAT IN HAND, Churchill came to Roosevelt on the mid-Atlantic. He desperately wanted the United States to send an expeditionary force to fight Adolf Hitler's legions.

Tragically, he returned home to a disappointed England—an England unable to send an expeditionary force into Europe even while Hitler was engaged in crushing Josef Stalin's hordes.

Now that the Russian campaign is practically decided in favor of Hitler, British morale, which hoped against hope for a Soviet victory, is lower than the bottommost ledge of Dover cliff.

No American expeditionary force and no Russian victory—these two negatives make an affirmative: Churchill's government will be overthrown!

For some time, there was more danger of an internal revolution in England than in Germany.

Victories breed cohesion; defeats produce dissolution.

On that basis, Germany is standing firmer than ever and Great Britain's internal peace is threatened.

Last week, we predicted the doom of Britain's empire in Europe on the information that France had overwhelmingly joined the victorious Axis powers.

This week, we predict the weakening of Britain in the Orient on the basis that Japan is determined to carve her way into the Eastern sun.

Recollect that Britain, supposedly one of the richest powers in the world, was down at the heels financially before she became involved in the present war.

From the outset, the New Deal Government, recognizing that Britain was broke, planned the *Lend-Lease Bill* not to save the Great Britain of 1939 but *to take over the remnants of the Britain to be in 1943.*

Roosevelt's insiders knew this for some time. Now, Churchill's government knows it.

From the outset, it was evident to all that Britain was no match with her army for the Germans. Nor was she a match in her factories for the Germans.

Churchill did not have enough sagacity to appreciate these things when he was plotting to unseat Neville Chamberlain. He engaged in war depending on an all-out support from America. Now all England knows the folly of Churchill's credulity. Now the English people have measured the man of words and appreciate that he is no match for Hitler.

* * *

We predict that, following the downfall of Churchill, the new leaders in England—if not Britain—will come to terms with Hitler, leaving the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and, possibly,



—St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Lower part of the buoy revealed

South Africa, isolated, and, probably, still at war.

We predict that, in America, the propagandists who attempted to educate us regarding Britain's certain victory, will be unhorsed. New riders, soon, will occupy their place.

We predict that a national defense policy will be pursued for years to come, America finding herself languishing under military rule.

It will be impossible to return to the normalcy of previous years because the New Deal Government, having failed to restore prosperity before the war, turned in desperation to a policy of converting this peaceful country into an arsenal of "democracy."

An arsenal it will remain with a financial-military *clique* ruling until — perhaps seven to ten years hence—they will bring about a war between America and Europe-Asia, for the control of South America, the world's richest jackpot.

We predict that England—not Britain—will join the Axis powers, realizing, in her bankruptcy, that her only salvation consists in adopting the non-gold economic system of Hitler.

* * *

Do not be deceived by the eight-point program excogitated for public consumption by Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt.

First of all—as we intimated last week—these gentlemen sound like the sepulchral voice of Woodrow Wilson who said something about the "sovereignty of small nations" and the "abandonment of the use of force."

The fact of the matter is that the two conferees on the high seas were agents for a bankrupt cause.

Britain was bankrupt financially, economically and militarily.

Roosevelt was bankrupt in the failure of the New Deal as a peace policy.

We predict the final banishment from office of the present New Dealers before the outbreak of Armageddon seven to ten years hence.

We predict an attempt to establish a National-Socialist Party in America with emphasis on the word "nationalist."

The Marxist democrats, turned militaristic, will obstruct the formation of this party even though it be necessary to outlaw it under the pretext of a national emergency brought about by an inter-continental war.

We predict that, if such happens, the National-Socialists in America—organized under that or some other name—eventually, will take control of government on this continent.

Predictions are dangerous—if not foolish. We remember what happened to the *Literary Digest* and its prediction relative to the Hoover-Roosevelt presidential election.

Nevertheless, we risk our necks and our reputation for accuracy on the above predictions, provided Japan and the Axis powers do not force us to get into a shooting war before seven years will have elapsed.

However, we recollect a thought previously expressed in this publication: It is the policy of the Axis to persuade the United States to spend itself into destruction. Federal Reserve loans mean bonds. Bonds mean taxes. Taxes mean higher costs of living. Higher costs of living mean industrial strife. Industrial strife means Government regimentation. Government regimentation means totalitarianism.

We predict, lastly, the end of democracy in America.

Take it or leave it—but file it away.

Index to Comment

We Predict ..... Page 3
A Letter to the President—No. 5 ..... Page 4
Detroit Transit Strike; Belittling Hitler ..... Page 5
Editorials ..... Page 6
Frank Murphy and the Knights of Columbus ..... Page 7
More on the Same Subject ..... Page 8
Paul V. McNutt; You Cannot Separate Communism and Soviet; Is Peace Impossible?; Britannia, Mother and Sweetheart ..... Page 9
Not an Oil Shortage, But British Bungling; Not Always Inefficiency ..... Page 10
Planned That Way ..... Page 11
An Answer to Critics of Archbishop Beckman ..... Page 12
Behind the War: Allies Broke Faith, Lloyd George Charges ..... Page 13
Voorhis Tells Congress About Money ..... Page 14
Bankruptcy Certain, Roosevelt Warned; Who Said It? ..... Page 15
A New Church, Stage and Altar; 8-Point Program Disappoints England ..... Page 18
Catholic Views Catholic; New Deal and the 8-Hour Day; The Rev. David C. Colony Writes a Letter ..... Page 19
Defense Program in a Mess ..... Page 20

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Letter to the President—No. 5

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:

It was with interest I read an account of your message to the Young Democratic Clubs convened at Louisville, Kentucky, last week.

Definitely, the young men of our country need kindly advice, fearless leadership and sterling example.

Your Excellency, busy as you are with international affairs as well as with national problems, could not have expended your time better in addressing this sector of Americans.

I was deeply impressed with the philosophy you expounded in the course of your message. You said:

"Across both oceans, on the oceans, and above the oceans, the struggle is one of armed forces with the ghastly result of destruction and slaughter on a scale unparalleled in modern history. It had to be so. Against naked force the only possible defense is naked force."

Bluntly, I fear the majority of Christians in our country who are mindful of the principles enunciated by the Master will not coincide with your views. In fact, I suspect they will find in these words of your message the germs of a philosophy which, if not trampled out, will mature into a code of brutality not dissimilar to the vagaries presented by Nietsche and some Prussians who maintained that might it right.

I know that you register your disapproval of all those who uphold that heinous doctrine — "might is right."

I know you would counter any accusations by stating, once the conflict is terminated, you will lead America back to the doctrine of "right is might."

From a pedagogical and psychological viewpoint, it would be difficult to bring about such a reversal; for, as the twig is bent, so will the tree stand.

* * *

Desperate men oftentimes adopt desperate principles. Today, I was privileged to speak to a Catholic gentleman who, until two years ago, spent his entire life in Germany. He is a priest in good standing. His experience is wide. He knows Prussianism as it was. He knows Kaiserism as it was. He knows the first World War as it was. He knows the suffering in Germany as it was. He knows religion in Germany as it was. He knows politics in Germany as it was. He knows Hitlerism in Germany as it was and as it is.

This venerable priest and I discussed your message, among other things, pondering upon your doctrine of force. We viewed it in the mirror both of Germany and of the United States.

As for Germany, he recalled the cruel subjugation of that vast population led into a military and political trap by Prussian war lords — the same population whose sons were decimated in the World War; the same population whose survivors were cast into the ditch by the robber barons seated around the so-called peace table of Versailles.

Indeed, the patient German people were foolish enough, following 1919, to think that political parties could rescue them from their misery. In fact, this old priest was a member of the Central Catholic Party. He and many of his confreres supported Chancellor Breuning — a gentleman too gentlemanly to cope with the international situation; a gentleman too refined to scheme against the schemers of Versailles.

Meanwhile, Communism was making rapid advances in the Church and out of the Church. It thrived upon the general economic and social misery identified with oppression and poverty.

Finally, came Hitler. By 1932 the present Chancellor of Germany gave promise of being the dominant figure in Europe, which was already decayed.

* * *

At first, Hitler endeavored to cope with the situation by opposing might with right; by acting constitutionally. He was opposed on all sides.

Afterwards he adopted the policy you expressed, namely, "meet force with force" until one excess led to another; until one opponent fell after the other.

Among his opponents were members of the Catholic and Protestant clergy. Because they could not coincide with his views, he applied his philosophic principle of force to them.

Both Your Excellency and I know the results.

And, now, you are expounding that same theory that led Hitler into such excesses. Do you hope to meet with any better results? Do you hope to receive the approbation and co-operation of Catholic and Protestant clergymen?

These questions need not be answered because their answers are self-evident. In Germany the answers are concentration camps. In America similar answers will be the order of tomorrow.

Indeed, desperate men adopt desperate principles.

I recollect one Gospel story where Christ was attacked by the mob whose members planned to stone Him to death. He did not meet force with force. He fled them.

I recollect another Gospel story dramatized in the Garden of Gethsemane. Under the leadership of Judas Iscariot, violent men came out to apprehend the sorrowful Son of God. Impetuous Peter unsheathed his sword. Whirling it about his head, its blade severed the ear of a servant of the high priest. At this juncture, Christ intervened; He healed the wound of the hapless man; He enunciated to Peter the doctrine which contradicts the doctrine which you expressed in your message addressed to the Democratic Youth Convention at St. Louis. "Put up thy sword into its scabbard . . . They who use the sword shall perish by it."

* * *

It is not appropriate for me to proceed further in contrasting the doctrine of Christ with the doctrine of Franklin D. Roosevelt; for, I fear, some of your unChristly advisers put the words over your signature — the words of force — which in calmer moments you would not hesitate to repudiate. Moreover, in advocating the gospel of force, you are letting down the barriers of restraint which hitherto have held many of your domestic enemies in check. Unconsciously, you are teaching them to use force against you and your government.

How regrettable it will be if the day dawns upon America to find us settling our disputes not in the courts of law, not at the polls of election, but in the use of mobs, Thompson guns, poisoned cups and other barbarous devisals.

While referring to Christ's doctrine, which is identified with "put up thy sword," may I, in conclusion, comment momentarily upon your meeting with Mr. Churchill on the high seas. In our recollection the world was never in such turmoil as it is now. Racial, national, social, industrial and political storm clouds are lowering above us. The winds of passion are screeching in intemperate rage. The lightning flashes of destruction are crackling above our mastheads.

Under such circumstances you and Britain's Prime Minister met to discuss matters of moment.

Incidentally, the eight points synopsizing your discussion omitted to mention religious freedom — all of which may have been an oversight.

* * *

But I am thinking of another meeting at sea under circumstances somewhat similar to those in which we live. The locale was the Sea of Genesereth. The little bark in which the group met was swept about by winds and waves; slashed at by lightning forks until the ship's captain said: "Lord, save us or we perish!"

Indeed, asleep in the boat's cabin was Christ. Possibly, he was not so much asleep as we are prone to believe at times. Possibly, He was not welcome to attend the business which engaged the minds of the others.

Well, I need not dwell on that point. I simply am emphasizing that had you and Mr. Churchill and the others in your group asked Christ to save the world, else we perish, your meeting would have been more of a success. It is not too late.

Meanwhile, please consider a public disapproval of the gospel of force and a public acceptance of the Gospel of Christ.

Cordially yours,

SEBASTIAN IGNOTUS.

Soviet Blasphemy

A SOVIET call to God-loving peoples to defend Christian freedom is reported by the *New York Times* in a dispatch from Berne, Switzerland.

Says the *Times* dispatch:

"Charging the Nazis with 'menacing the very existence of Christianity' and seeking the overthrow of 'Christ the King,' to install in its place the 'myth of the twentieth century of Alfred Rosenberg,' Moscow radio in Slovak, Dutch, Roumanian and Bulgarian bulletins . . . called on 'all God-loving inhabitants of the occupied countries' to rise in defense of their religious freedom."

Soviet Russia interceding for Christ, the King is as incongruous as American Catholics befriending Communist Russia.

Is there no limit to blasphemy!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

Detroit Transit Strike

TWO LABOR UNIONS, one A. F. of L. and one C.I.O., declared war on each other last week in Detroit, tying up the city's municipally-owned transportation system and seriously inconveniencing thousands of office, industrial workers and shoppers who normally ride street cars and buses.

No question of wages, hours or working conditions was involved in the dispute. It was strictly a "jurisdictional fight" between A. F. of L.'s Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motorcoach Employes and the C.I.O.'s State, County and Municipal Workers of America.

The specific, immediate cause of the walkout, which deprived 400,000 daily car riders of transportation and robbed the taxpayers of $65,000 a day in revenue, was the *A. F. of L.'s objection to the C.I.O.'s use of company bulletin boards!*

But that was simply the climax to a long quarrel over the C.I.O.'s efforts to muscle in on the A. F. of L.'s control over the street railway employes.

While officials of the A. F. of L. union, which holds a collective bargaining contract with the city, charged the C.I.O. with raiding their membership by extravagant promises, C.I.O. leaders claimed a majority of maintenance workers and a strong minority of operators, and demanded an election among employes.

Negotiations for a settlement of the strike found Detroit's Mayor Jeffries assailed by each side as being partial to the other.

Elected chiefly through C.I.O. support, Jeffries refused to meet the A. F. of L.'s demand for exclusive bargaining rights, exclusive use of company bulletin boards, and exclusive check-off privileges.

Raising a point of fundamental philosophy on government and labor relations, Mayor Jeffries applied it on behalf of the C.I.O. Paradoxically, it is a point which the C.I.O. refuses to recognize when the shoe is on the other foot — the right of minorities.

C.I.O. unions everywhere, when in the majority, are ardently devoted to the principle of majority rule and the minority be damned, but in the Detroit strike the rights of the minority are held sacred. It happens to be the C.I.O.

SOCIAL JUSTICE holds no brief for either side. We believe the strike is an offense against the community, a mockery of law and order, and a manifestation of irresponsible union leadership.

The A. F. of L. not only struck without notice, despite the 30-day law in Michigan, but has threatened to call a city-wide sympathy strike among other municipal workers, including the city waterworks.

According to our understanding, labor unions were designed to protect workers against exploitation. Insofar as relations with the City of Detroit are concerned, the A. F. of L. union here involved has done a good job, for its members are reputedly the highest paid of any street railway workers in the nation.

Why, then, must the C.I.O. be concerned about organizing them unless it be solely for the purpose of increasing the power, prestige, and the revenue, of the C.I.O.?

Belittling Hitler

THE AMERICAN word-warriors are having a veritable field day belittling Adolf Hitler.

Radio, movies and newspapers vie with each other in ridiculing the Nazi Fuehrer.

Holding no brief for Adolf—in spite of what some of our best critics say—we are inclined to suspect that the German leader is "making a monkey out of" the word-warriors whose armies have been defeated and whose boasts have been reduced to thin air.

You cannot defeat Hitler by ridiculing him. You cannot expurge Naziism from the world by bombarding it with bombast. And you cannot "kid" the American public forever.

Deeds are more eloquent than words. If less time were spent belittling Hitler and *more time devoted to honest national defense with no profit for any person,* we would go further and fare better.

The belittlers have a reason. Precisely, they aim to entertain the American public while robbing the public purse.

Let's see about that:

Now that we are practically in war, we make bold to suggest that the fifteenth principle advocated by SOCIAL JUSTICE be put into practice. In plain language, *let us conscript wealth as well as men.*

Let us impose a 100 per cent profit tax on all business—including the fur business, the jewelry business, the theater business, the radio business, the clothing business, the textile business, the grocery business, the meat business, the legal business, the medical business—*every business!*

Is it not ridiculous to have refugees coming to our shores with bags of diamonds which are marketed for American dollars?

Why not conscript that diamond money for the duration?

SOCIAL JUSTICE believes in preparedness. Long since it has preached the principle that if and when conscription of men is decreed for the defense of America, let there be conscription of wealth. But we do not believe that a defense emergency justifies such conscription.

* * *

It is our opinion that we cannot stop this New Deal Government's sooner or later getting us into a shooting war. Before this eventuates, let the common people raise their voices for a conscription of profit and idle wealth—a 100 per cent conscription of wealth—on the same basis that there is a 100 per cent conscription of man power.

If this program takes hold in America the war-mongers will be the first to yell "Uncle"!

There is that beautiful Hyde Park estate owned by the Roosevelt family. Certainly, all the acres of Hyde Park are not needed to sustain the Roosevelts. Why not demand that these acres be conscripted to house the soldiers instead of paying politicians high prices for wasteland? If, that is, conscription of men, and all-out sacrifice is so necessary!

There are millions of bank accounts with idle money waiting for "the day" to buy up real estate and stocks at depreciated prices, as happened in Germany, France and elsewhere at the conclusion of the last war. Demand that such moneys be conscripted and put to use immediately.

There are the idle reserves of banks — particularly the Federal Reserve Banks — which are crying for conscription at this moment.

There are the profits of the steel industrialists, of the motor industrialists, of the munitions merchants which are piling high. We might demand their conscription.

There is all-out aid for Britain. Let it be all-out without any exception. Instead of crying out against it, cry out for it until the last profit penny, the last idle dollar is taken from the war-mongering group responsible for this war.

If this program gets under way now, you can watch the war-mongers going into reverse tomorrow.

* * *

Belittling Hitler with words will never win this all-out war in which Mr. Roosevelt now says we are engaged.

It is a trick, we repeat, to amuse, and bemuse, the American public while the profiteers and their dupes steal your purses!

Mr. Roosevelt says "we have a war to win." We do not agree with him; but if that is so, let us get into it 100 per cent.

Let every profit penny and idle dollar be conscripted and let every person be limited to a common standard of living.

If $40 a week is good enough for a factory worker's family, it is good enough for the banker's family, for a motor magnate's family, for a merchant's family.

This means closing up the night life, the champagne bars, the race tracks and the playgrounds of the privileged.

That is the way to beat Hitler—if that is what we really are after.

A Pro-War Man

FOR MONTHS the Administration has recognized that the tired, aging Col. Henry L. Stimson, unable to work more than three or four hours a day, needed assistance to perform the burdensome duties of War Secretary.

As senior advisor the Administration chose Major General John F. O'Ryan, who as long ago as last January admitted in a radio debate that he favored United States entrance into the war against Germany. Unlike Mr. Roosevelt, he does not "hate war."

In testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee during consideration of the *Lend-Lease Bill,* Gen. O'Ryan deplored the fact that Americans were peace-loving citizens.

"I believe that our vital interest in the outcome of the present war has been obscured by some queer thinking and, as well, by propaganda," he asserted. "As an example, for 20 years our people have been deceived by propaganda against war as an institution with the result that they view war as they do sin, that is to say, they are against it."

Because of Secretary Stimson's physical incapacity, Senator Worth D. Clark of Idaho pointed out in the Senate, "there is a fair inference that from now on Gen. John F. O'Ryan will have much to say not only concerning the technical administration of the War Department, but probably concerning the entire foreign policy of the United States at this critical time."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

So It Is Labor Day

TODAY is Labor Day.

This space was to have been given to an editorial consideration of the gains of labor and the labor outlook in the United States —and so it is.

What has labor gained since last Labor Day?

As these lines are written metropolitan Detroit has been tied up by a strike of street car and bus operators on city-owned transportation lines.

No question of wages, hours or working conditions was involved; indeed, all these benefits of organization are above the average in Detroit.

Instead, the strike involved a "jurisdictional dispute" between the American Federation of Labor and the rival C.I.O. The A. F. of L., with its long tradition of union responsibility, is making another last-ditch stand against the encroachment of C.I.O.-ism, with its Moscow-trained radicals out-promising more conservative leaders.

The people of Detroit, who own their own street railway system, and whose taxes pay the wages of the men on strike, walked and hitch-hiked to work, drove their own cars, or rode taxicabs. The resulting traffic congestion in downtown Detroit has been costly in its delays and perilous to personal safety.

As is customary in such strikes, the good humor of the first days wore off; public resentment was not inclined to split hairs over the niceties of rival union issues. On the other hand, community opinion turned against all labor leadership and the result will be a loss for labor, not a gain.

The tie-up, of course, will be broken by some concession, or the situation in Detroit will grow worse. Threats of a "sympathetic" involvement of other city services, including the waterworks, already have been heard.

* * *

A major labor strike in Detroit, or anywhere in its industrial area, is always significant—not to say ominous.

As long ago as his tenure as Governor of Michigan, Mr. Frank Murphy and President Roosevelt exchanged their now famous observation that "if and when Communism comes to America, the revolution will break first in Detroit."

No single factor in the growth of C.I.O.-ism under Moscow-directed leaders can be compared to the impetus given C.I.O. lawlessness in Michigan by Governor Murphy's temporizing with the sit-down strikes which took over the automobile industry.

The Governor refused to use the National Guard to evict strikers who had seized the auto plants, because, he said, "half the Guard was C.I.O." and could not be relied upon for loyalty if ordered into action.

Now, the Michigan National Guard is away at camp—training for the Hitler-haters' dreamed-of invasion of Europe. An echo of the Roosevelt-Murphy prediction was heard in the early days of the strike negotiations when Mayor Jefferies, elected as a C.I.O. candidate, startled conferes with the outburst:

"I am not going to stand for a revolution in Detroit!"

A day or so later, an A. F. of L. spokesman warned that any attempt to run cars in a compromise with the C.I.O. would render the streets of Detroit "unsafe for anyone to use."

Some weeks before, a C.I.O. official had said that "people who read the newspapers know by this time that the U.A.W. (C.I.O) s not very much afraid of policemen."

President Thomas told delegates at the recent C.I.O. convention that among the benefits of C.I.O. membership in Detroit was a traffic violation "fix." This was indignantly denied by a Detroit judge—another Murphy.

These are some of the "stated principles" of C.I.O. leadership.

* * *

To further aggravate the labor outlook, the New Deal administration now announces that a curtailment of automobile production is soon to dismiss some 400,000 workers—only a portion of whom can be re-absorbed into war industries, now in blueprint or building stage. The bulk of these jobless victims of the Roosevelt war emergency will, of course, be in the Detroit region.

At the same time Mr. Roosevelt is quoted in the newspapers as saying that women will have to be used in defense industries.

It seems to us that the picture is one of utter bankruptcy in policy and leadership—bankruptcy in union labor leadership, and bankruptcy in the administration's domestic labor policy.

To talk of our international responsibilities, and of waging a foreign war to destroy Hitlerism, in the presence of this domestic labor situation is worse than silly—it is intolerable incompetency!

Some of the more forthright and uncharitable of Mr. Roosevelt's critics have charged that the President's advisers have long wanted a war, or a serious national emergency, to cover up the collapse invited by eight years of New Deal failure.

In this view, disorder at home is as "useful" to their purposes as any threat from abroad. In other words: *"If we can't have a war, let's have a revolution!"*

Double Talk – By F. D. R.

THOUSANDS of fathers and mothers were gladdened last week when they read that 200,000 draftees were to be freed from Army camps by December 10th.

The news, issued by the War Department, followed almost immediately after the "one-man victory" vote in the House designed to keep the boys in camp for a total period of two and one-half years.

Credulous persons received the pronouncement from the War Department with joy.

More experienced persons read the full pronouncement, looking to find a "joker."

Indeed, the joker was there—face up! It read that the 200,000 boys would be out by December 10, *"unless the international situation prevented such action."*

On the same day President Roosevelt said, according to the United Press, "that the American people are not fully aware of the international situation and warned that they *must realize they have a war to win*—a war which he assumes will last through 1943."

* * *

Either the Government officers have their signals mixed or are engaging in double talk to deceive the American people.

It is our opinion that the signals were not mixed.

It is our opinion that the War Department release and the President's pronouncement had two specific objects in mind.

As for the War Department, it appeared that an effort was being made to calm down the ugly spirit manifested in every draftee camp—a spirit associated with the common thought that Mr. Roosevelt had betrayed the boys and broken his promise to them.

As for Mr. Roosevelt's pronouncement, one must go to England to search out the motives behind it. Englishmen were disappointed because the United States House of Representatives showed such a tremendous division on the proposition of keeping boys in service.

Britishers were doubly disappointed when Winston Churchill brought home his eight innocuous points, not one of which actually committed the United States to a shooting war against Germany.

The Britishers should take warning. A politician who has not kept his promises to the American people is likely to run true to form in breaking promises made to the British.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Frank Murphy and the Knights of Columbus

THE "Moon over Miami" transferred its beaming influence last week to Atlantic City, where the Knights of Columbus — more than 1,400 strong — convened in delegation representing some 400,000 dues-paying members of that fraternal organization.

America — Catholic, Protestant and Jewish America — waited expectantly for a clarifying report from the convention of the Knights of Columbus. What made the front page, however, was the publicity given to Justice Murphy's political harangue delivered from a rostrum around which sat Bishops Gannon, Leach, Eustace and Archbishop Mooney of Detroit, executive chairman of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Prior to Mr. Justice Murphy's harangue, New York delegates attempted to bring before the convention a resolution condemning Communism and United States aid to Soviet Russia. This New York state resolution, we are told, was pigeonholed at the request of a certain "higher-up" who entertained the opinion that its passage would embarrass the Government and, at the same time, portray the Knights of Columbus — a lay organization — as taking the lead in Catholic thought, in so far as no convention of Bishops as yet has condemned aid to Russia.

One delegate asked if there was any prospect of any convention of Bishops "approving" Communism.

Incidentally, the New York state convention of the American Legion passed the resolution which Knights of Columbus were prevented from acting upon.

* * *

But back to Justice Murphy's speech: Humbly recognizing the distinguished presence of his Archbishop before whom he was honored to speak, the Associate Member of the United States Supreme Court delivered himself of a typical New Deal speech which will remain on the records of the Knights of Columbus as an historic document of omission and confusion.

Without offering any proof, Frank Murphy, who is not himself a K. of C., tried to impose on the minds of the delegates the thought that Naziism is *a more dangerous enemy to Christianity than is Communism!*

In doing so, untold millions of radio listeners were exposed to the mellifluous, Ciceronean sentences of this wizardy word weaver who failed to discuss the substantial principle involved, namely, is it moral to co-operate with Communism?

SOCIAL JUSTICE disavows any intent to challenge the honesty and intrepid sincerity of the Associate Justice. We are concerned merely with his persistent inability to handle the hammer of theology in driving straight home a moral nail.

The good Justice, it is true, hammered home harpingly certain *dicta* expressed by the late Venerable Pontiff Pius XI. Graphically, he drew word pictures depicting the dire events about to happen to civilization should Adolf Hitler prove victorious — Christianity will bow her head; democracy will seek sanctuary in oblivion; civilization and the cross of Christ will vanish beneath the shadow of the broken, but uplifted cross of the Swastika.

Definitely, affirmed the Associate Justice, Communism is an evil — a far away evil, if you will; an inefficient evil, if you please; a perishable evil, if you must.

But, Naziism is a pressing menace, a military menace, *a greater menace.*

Therefore, the Associate Justice — basking in the purple light of his own Archbishop — pleaded all aid for the Reds.

At first, his intellect—if not his memory —suffered a heinous blackout.

Gone were the doctrines of the Russian revolutions of 1917.

Gone were the distressing cries of 20-million murdered Christians.

Gone were the attacks of Lenin, Trotzky, Bela Kun and Stalin against God and religion.

Gone were the boasts of the commissars to create a world revolution.

Afterwards did this blackout affect his intellect when he failed to recollect the burning, throbbing, fearless, plain words of Pius XI, who said:

"See to it, Venerable Brethren, that the Faithful do not allow themselves to be deceived! Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any manner whatsoever."

What is intrinsically wrong can never be good — despite circumstance of time, place, property or life itself.

There is no need for promulgating that point. Oceans of silence can never erase the words of Pius XI relative to Communism — words long since carried into every Catholic household on this continent; long since publicized by every Catholic periodical.

No matter if Naziism gives promise of being victorious, Catholics with consciences cannot co-operate with Communism in turning the tide from victory to defeat.

Two Catholic Viewpoints

"See to it, Venerable Brethren, that the Faithful do not allow themselves to be deceived! Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any manner whatsoever."
— Pope Pius XI.

* * *

"While the Communist philosophy remains a danger to the Christian religion, it is not today the greatest danger . . . We stand against Communism but we should not permit this to blind us to our own interests."
— Associate Justice Frank Murphy.

There are worse things than death; worse things than defeat; worse things than loss of democracy; worse things than failure of the New Deal — or the British Empire.

Failure, loss, defeat and death must be accepted rather than join hands with any presumptive saviour whose means are intrinsically wrong.

As a theological carpenter, endeavoring to strike home a nail of morality, Justice Murphy is a "rag-picker."

* * *

On December 11, 1937 — at the 50th Anniversary celebration of Jewish Yeshiva College, New York City — Frank Murphy, then Governor of Michigan, affirmed that "religious freedom still means that every man has an inalienable right — a right not granted to him by a superior power, but a right that is naturally his — to follow the dictates of conscience in matters of religion."

Has a cannibal an "inalienable" right to murder and eat a white man?

Has a follower of Moloch an "inalienable" right to sacrifice his daughter in a flaming furnace?

All rights come from a superior power, either directly or indirectly.

And that Superior Power is the One True and Only God Who created man and Who sent His Only Begotten Son — as predicted in the *Old Testament* — to be the World-Made-Flesh; to be adored by us; and to be followed in His teachings.

In the same Yeshiva College address ex-Governor Murphy said: "You know and most intelligent men know and willingly concede the greatness in governmental realms of Disraeli and Oscar Straus; in finance of the Rothschilds and Jacob Schiff; in science of Einstein and Flexner; in philosophy, of Spinoza and Marx; of Rubinstein in music; and of Stephen Wise and Nathan Straus."

Disraeli, the imperialist.

Rothschild, the international banker.

Jacob Schiff, the contributor to the Russian revolution.

Einstein, the denier of a personal God.

Spinoza, the sophist.

Marx, the Communist.

The greatness of these political, economic and scientific "greats"!

Again referring to the Yeshiva College speech, the haranguer of the Knights of Columbus at Atlantic City spoke before his Jewish audience in 1937 these words: "Added to these similarities in faith, Christian and Jew have in common a goal which, in a sense, *is larger, more vital, than religion itself.* That goal is the fulfillment of the ideal of democracy in its every phase . . . political, social and economic."

So democracy is more important than religion!

That is Frank Murphy's theology.

That is the mental background of the man who was selected to address the national convention of representative Catholic laymen, motivating them to pursue a policy of all aid to Russia.

* * *

We recognize that Associate Justice Frank Murphy would not have stood on the platform before his own Archbishop to

(Continued on Page 8)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

(Continued from Page 7)

address the delegates of the Knights of Columbus unless he had been invited to do so by one higher in authority than himself.

Should not the personage who pressed Justice Murphy into service share with him the guilt as well as the glory?

This personage is responsible as is an Edgar Bergen for the Charlie McCarthy murphyisms which ran counter to the teachings of Pius XI:

"Communism is intrinsically wrong!"

Definitely, many Knights of Columbus will repudiate — as they should — the colored advice administered to their delegates by Justice Frank Murphy at Atlantic City.

They know that Lenin, Trotzky, Bela Kun and Stalin have committed aggressions against Christianity which are history.

They know that, as yet, Hitler has committed no such quantitative or qualitative aggressions.

They know that our New Deal Government is opposed to Hitler not because of his moral ideologies but because of his economics.

It is a sad day when a principle of religion is sacrificed to support a principle of man-made economics.

More on the Same Subject

JUSTICE MURPHY reminded his Knights of Columbus audience of certain statements made by the late Pius XI.

His sin of omission, however, was flagrant. He failed to quote the explicit, unequivocal command issued by the eminent author of *"Atheistic Communism"* which counsels:

"See to it, Venerable Brethren, that the Faithful do not allow themselves to be deceived! Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any manner whatsoever."

Indeed, Christians regard the above words as a command. We regard this command as binding in conscience on every Cardinal, Archbishop, Bishop, priest and layman in the Catholic Church.

True, the Pope's command needs promulgation by a Bishop in each diocese — a promulgation which, in some instances, has not been forthcoming in an adequate manner; a promulgation, in other instances, which has been nullified by the statements of some persons — particularly those who by their applause and beaming presence endorsed the unCatholic viewpoint expressed by Justice Murphy.

That, frankly, is our opinion. It is an opinion formulated by our own conscience and corroborated by literally thousands of letters coming to our offices from disappointed Catholics and Protestants throughout the nation.

Naturally we are in a position to receive letters both in a quantity and in a quality which the Ordinaries of some dioceses could not expect to receive. These letters are a barometer, in one sense, of the attitude being adopted by many of the faithful.

Throughout our correspondence on this matter there is woven a web of thought which can be expressed in the following question: "Why do not the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in America unanimously uphold the words of Pius XI relative to no co-operation with Communism in any manner whatsoever?"

Beyond question of a doubt there is a multitude of men and women disturbed over the seeming compromise which the silence on the part of some members of the hierarchy is suggesting — a compromise with Communism.

* * *

It is not a question of whether Naziism or Communism is the "worst enemy" of Christianity in the modern world. It is not a question if Hitler is more malicious than Stalin. It is simply a question of a Pope's having spoken officially, specifically and unequivocally commanding his flock throughout the world to have nothing to do with Communism in any manner whatsoever — a command that has not been repudiated by his successor; a command which is as binding upon the consciences of Catholics, as far as that is concerned, as any other command of the Church.

There will be some who will take objection to the above statements by maintaining that the words of Pius XI commanding us to have no co-operation with Communism in any manner whatsoever were not spoken *ex cathedra;* and were spoken merely in an encyclical letter. They will rest their argument, possibly, on some hair-splitting logic borrowed from the textbooks of compromise and diplomacy.

The ordinary Catholic lady or gentleman is not interested in such fine distinctions. As one priest expressed it to us over his signature (which we must safeguard) many Catholics "will begin to regard all Church laws, canon law, diocesan regulations, etc., etc., as matters which bind no more in conscience on the people than does Pius XI's command bind upon the consciences of priests, distinguished laymen and Bishops who either directly or indirectly by word or by deed, acquiesce in supporting Communism."

"Communism is *intrinsically* wrong," said Pius XI.

If Communism was intrinsically wrong when Pius XI wrote those words, it is intrinsically wrong today, and will be intrinsically wrong tomorrow. No ameliorating circumstances can alter that definition. No material end, even though it be the end of saving our properties, our Government or our lives, can justify our co-operating with Communists or our supporting any project, directly or indirectly, to aid Communism.

Good Catholics know that. Because they know that, they feel they have been let down.

While comparisons are odious, nevertheless one cannot help but compare the attitude of those Catholics in England who subscribe to the expressions published by many English Catholic periodicals; one cannot help but admire the heroic and courageous statement issued by the Catholic Cardinal of London, England — a nation actually at war with Germany.

As yet, the N.C.W.C. — regarded as the official voice of Catholicism in America — has not emphasized adequately the teaching that "Communism is intrinsically wrong," nor has it insisted upon the Papal policy that Catholics in no manner can co-operate with Communism.

* * *

The Knights of Columbus convention before which Mr. Justice Murphy spoke, in the presence of Archbishop Edward Mooney of Detroit, chief executive officer of the N.C.W.C., may have repercussions in the consciences of the 80 per cent portion of Catholics who are opposed to our entrance in this war now raging abroad or to assisting Communists "in any manner whatsoever."

Some of them might conclude that if the keystone paragraph of the *"Atheistic Communism"* is sacrificed for the cause of diplomacy or for the cause of some material end, then let *"Quadragesimo Anno"* and all its contents be cashiered. Others might conclude that if the Papal teaching relative to Communism is so lightly disregarded and so flagrantly unemphasized, then episcopal orders relative to gambling in churches, etc., can be laughed off for the cause of expediency.

One cannot thumb his nose at one Papal order and expect that other Papal orders — even though promulgated and emphasized —will be respected.

We are not graduate theologians, let alone doctors of divinity. But we are, we hope, gifted with a modicum of logic sufficient to see some of the consequences on Catholicism as a whole in America.

We disdain to comment upon the trumped up, verbal trickery of "saving democracy." There is something more important than democracy. It is saving Christianity from compromise; it is saving Catholicism for the unity of which its textbooks boast. And it has nothing to do with saving the British Empire, the New Deal Government, the present economic system, church buildings and properties, or the good will of the international bankers to whom many of our churchmen are in debt.

Incidentally, we have no respect for the steward of the Gospel who made friends with the mammon of iniquity to save his hide against the day when the crash came.

* * *

At the present writing the United States is committed to assist the government of Russia — not the people of Russia from whom God and religion have been ostracized. Either directly or indirectly, we are extending loans to Josef Stalin's government. Either directly or indirectly, we are supplying, or about to supply, materials of war to Joseph Stalin's government. No matter how hairs are split, the United States Government is co-operating with Communism and with Communism's pledged ally — Great Britain.

Hitherto, our draftees had no just reason to become conscientious objectors because there was no shooting war. If and when a shooting war eventuates, it is our belief that Catholic draftees will lay down their arms and become conscientious objectors to a Communist alliance.

In conclusion, we are taking the long view. We are looking towards the day of reckoning when the Frank Murphys in the laity and the Bishop Hurleys in the heirarchy will wish that they had better remembered to "seek first the kingdom of God and His justice" — not man's justice — and "all things will be added."

Meanwhile, the Catholics of Spain, of Portugal, of South America, of France, of Austria, of Italy, of Belgium, of the Netherlands, of Germany and elsewhere, are wondering what kind of Catholics we are in the United States of America.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

Paul V. McNutt

THE RECENT K. of C. convention was also addressed by Paul V. McNutt, Mr. Roosevelt's Federal Securities Administrator.

The fair-haired glamour boy from Indiana devoted much of his address to praise of the subversive, French-revolutionary *"Liberty, Equality and Fraternity"!*

Unquestionably, a French revolution was needed when it happened. Unfortunately, the atheistic radicals — and not the clerics and monarchists and Catholics of France — executed the revolution.

Then, as now, those radicals, infiltrated with the doctrines of Voltaire and the encyclopaedists, were anti-God, anti-religion, anti-liberty, anti-equality and anti-fraternity.

Then, as now, the factors of the revolution used bewitching words to allure the oppressed people — words which were as empty of truth as a sucked egg is of substance.

The "Liberty" they preached meant liberty for their own licenses and slavery for religion.

The "Equality" they preached meant equality and tolerance between good and evil as was exemplified when they placed a strumpet from the streets on the tabernacle of Notre Dame.

The "Fraternity" they preached was akin to that same kind of fraternity which exists among thieves who are leagued together against all honest men.

The French Revolution prospered. Eventually continental, oriental masonry rose like froth to the top of a cesspool. And a fictitious "democracy," emerging like a rat from a sewer plagued the people of France with poverty, taxation, disunion and war.

And the gentleman from Indiana mercilessly damned Field Marshal Henri Petain because he drove out the money changers as did Christ; because he castigated the Blums as the Master castigated the Scribes and Pharisees; because he condemned tolerance, equality and fraternity with Communism as Christ condemned tolerance, equality and fraternity with Beelzebub.

Do not forget that it was the French revolution which trumped up the triple slogan of liberty, equality and fraternity as their moderns trump up democracy, freedom and humanitarianism.

Democracy?

God save the mark, now that Great Britain and the United States are leagued against Esthonia, Lithuania, Latvia and Finland!

The two great democracies, Britain and America, are "saving democracy" by perpetuating in power the government of Josef Stalin, which hates democracy and God with like venom.

And that was the message delivered to the recent national convention of Knights of Columbus by Paul V. McNutt — a message which, boiled down, is this: "Restore France into the hands of the radicals and drive out of France the men, under Petain, who are saving it for Christ!"

You Cannot Separate Communism and Soviet

EVER SINCE the Russian revolution, the Comintern installed in Moscow has been working for world revolution. And it has "always been the policy of this organization to make out that it was quite distinct from the Soviet government," says a current issue of the London *Patriot.*

That, you may also remember, was the "dodge" which Stalin put over on America when the United States Government protested that the Communists were breaking their promise made to Mr. Roosevelt at the time he "recognized" the U.S.S.R.

An official note from the Kremlin to the American State Department disclaimed responsibility for the world revolution of the Communists or their activities within the United States.

Despite the disclosure by the Dies Committee of several thousand Reds on the United States Government payroll, they are still there almost two years later.

* * *

In a note addresed to the Soviet government (Sept. 7, 1921), complaining of the attempts from Moscow to undermine the British empire, the late Lord Curzon pointed out:

"The plea, indeed, that the Soviet government is one authority and the Third International (Comintern) another . . . is of so transparent a character as not to deceive anyone who has the slightest acquaintance with the case."

Steklov, writing in *Izvestia* (Nov. 7, 1922) said that "mutual solidarity of the Soviet Republics and the Communist International is an accomplished fact."

Kamenev, in a report given *Pravda* (Jan. 12, 1924) stated: "The Central Committee is not only the Central Committee of our Party (Russian Communist Party), *but it rules the Central Government of our country.* (U.S.S.R.)"

In a speech given in *Pravda* (Dec. 15, 1925) Radek states: "The *Central Committee is the Soviet government,* and lack of confidence in the Central Committee of the party means lack of confidence in the Soviet government."

And the *Patriot* comments:

"It is obvious that there is an essential unity of the various Bolshevik organizations known as the Russian Communist Party, the Soviet government and the Communist International."

Is Peace 'Impossible?'

THE British view of this war is that peace with the Nazis is impossible.

That has been echoed in Washington by Mr. Roosevelt.

He has, says the *Chicago Tribune,* "repeated Mr. Churchill's declarations with as much finality as if he were the commander in chief of millions of American soldiers fighting in Europe.

"But none of the last ditch warriors finds an alternative to a negotiated peace. They can merely denounce such a peace as fraudulent in its origin, deceptive in its purposes, and designed to complete Hitler's conquest of the world. This is extravagant thinking, in spite of the Fuehrer's demonstrated double dealing and untrustworthiness.

"If the Russians soften the Germans to the point where they seem to be ripe for a final push, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt may be determined to deal the decisive blow and take the responsibility of policing Europe indefinitely. If no such weakening occurs, nothing is in prospect, as everybody now admits, except virtually interminable war, the consequences of which to everybody will become more apparent as time goes on.

"The British are fighting for the preservation of their country and their empire. Our war party is supposed to be principally engaged for the same result. There are decorations to these war purposes. Mr. Roosevelt's four freedoms everywhere in the world are a part of that, a part which analysis reveals as meaningless. This war will not establish the four freedoms everywhere in the world and any one who thinks about it knows that it is nonsense to make any such pretenses of war objectives.

"England has little more reason or right to try to dominate the continent of Europe than we have, and we have professed many times our doctrine of aloofness from foreign power politics. The statement that Hitler seeks a peace merely as a lull in the fighting so that he may reorganize his resources, soothe his opponents into a false security, and then spring upon them again may be a guess at a purpose.

"The peace might be one of armed watchfulness, but surely the resources of the British would be equal to that, and our defense program need not stop with the end of fighting.

"For the American Government to throw its influence against peace at this time would be a crime against the country. Any suggestion that we have an obligation to interfere in European or Asiatic affairs *is a base betrayal of this nation* and especially of its young men."

Britannia, Mother —and Sweetheart!

"IT SHOULD be easy to understand why Mr. Roosevelt should be critical of Mackenzie King," observes the *San Francisco Leader,* Aug. 9).

"Had he (King) followed Mr. Roosevelt's lead, Canada would now have conscription and she would not be making England pay for what the Mother Country buys in Canada. The United States, under Mr. Roosevelt's skillful guidance, is far more filial to Mother England than the dominion to the north.

"The difference between President and Premier may be one of viewpoint. England is a mother to Canada (and what a mother!) but to Mr. Roosevelt she is a sweetheart.

"She has always been that, and long before England ever heard of Mr. Roosevelt. His love for England was imbibed with his mother's milk and will probably never, never die. Like Secretary Stimson, it is built to endure any number of kicks in the face.

"For Mr. Roosevelt's courtship of England, the era of moonlight and roses will never end. And England is prepared to furnish any amount of moonshine as long as Mr. Roosevelt foots the bill for roses, which he is willing to do as long as the patience, gullibility and money of the American taxpayer can stand the strain.

"Mr. King is a practical man. Reared under the Union Jack, his view of England is realistic. He knows that she is really a raddled old harridan in a wig, store teeth and false front, and that she is even falser inside than out. Still, she is a mother, after all, and he is willing to kick in for his share of home maintenance providing that the blowzy old kelter does her share of the housekeeping.

"Mr. King is a Canadian who believes that Canada comes first. Mr. Roosevelt is (or was) an American with whom England comes first.

"Mr. Roosevelt dotes, but Mr. King doubts."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Calls for Investigation

Not an Oil Shortage, But British Bungling

AMERICANS who are making the sacrifice of gasoline rationing ought to read the news from London — *and think about it.*

The British government asked English workers to forego their accustomed holiday trips to watering places, in order to conserve gasoline and to expedite the movement of trains on British communication lines.

England, you know, is *in the war* and the island, we're told, momentarily expects Nazi bombings and even an armed invasion.

But, despite their government's admonition and the presence of this wartime emergency, Britishers could not and would not be deprived of their 'oliday. The British newspapers castigated the English public for its "lack of the spirit of sacrifice" and "un-co-operation." Maybe the English do not like the *clique* that is running their war, either.

Americans received this report as Oil Commissar Ickes ordered Eastern gas stations closed and gasoline conservation enforced through a rationing program.

The American petroleum czar has even promised priorities on fuel oil for the coming Winter, with the result that American homes, schools and churches may have to resort to the fuelless, heatless days of the first World War — in order that fuel oil may be diverted to defense industries, or sent to England.

The Government has asked the American people to conserve on electric power for national defense, and to aid Britain by shutting off the radio, extinguishing lights, cutting down refrigeration, etc.; but the British, in the war and on the fighting front, travel on their railway trains and highways and take their holiday as usual.

Congressional leaders admit that the administration plans to enforce these peacetime economy measures "to inculcate a spirit of sacrifice in Americans," thus to prepare them for an inevitably lower standard of living!

* * *

The American people are saps; but they should demand an immediate and thorough airing of their oil situation.

America produces oil far beyond the needs of this entire country, and enough for England, too. There is no shortage or any sign of an oil shortage. There is simply a shortage of tankers because we gave them to Britain, who is deliberately using them elsewhere!

German, Italian, Danish, Norwegian and Axis-controlled tankers by the score are rusting in internment in the ports of South America.

Why shouldn't Great Britain buy these idle tankers, if the empire needs oil tankers so badly?

Or, if the Latin American nations are such good neighbors and close co-operators of Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal war policy, why could not the United States arrange to lease a few of these idle oil ships, instead of surrendering our own tankers to Britain and thus creating a wholly unnecessary oil shortage in this country?

SOCIAL JUSTICE is offering no prizes for the answer; but it does seem that you ought to think about it, even if only for the mental exercise.

* * *

The British people have never been informed of the amount of aid which the United States of America has already given, or is now giving, to Britain.

And the American people have not been told of the British stubbornness and stupidity which creates the "oil shortage" which Mr. Ickes has imposed upon the Eastern seaboard, and which, Washington says, will be extended to the rest of the country soon.

Even Anglophiles within the administration attribute Great Britain's poor showing in the war to the inefficiency, incompetency and stupidity of British agents. The O.P.M. officials are completely disgusted.

A nationally known figure in the oil industry is said to have taken issue with Petroleum Co-ordinator Ickes on the necessity for any shortage or rationing in the Eastern states. This oil man submitted to Mr. Ickes a simple remedy which would give Britain all the oil she needs and leave the Eastern United States with an additional 10-million barrels a month.

The oil magnate, whose name was withheld at his own request, wrote to Mr. Ickes as follows:

"It is a fact that all refineries having a large daily capacity have been operating and producing petroleum supplies on the North Atlantic seaboard, which could be used in the United Kingdom.

"Further, the Atlantic seaboard is the nearest source of supply and it is an admitted fact that in war time overseas shipments have priority over domestic requirements, as was the case in the World War and must be an accepted fact today.

"In my opinion, there is no excuse for a shortage for domestic consumer requirements on the Atlantic seaboard, except for the continuous and existing inefficiencies of the British operation, and our compliance, in granting their frequent requests for additional American tanker tonnage, which should not have been granted and are not properly justified or needed by them today . . ."

* * *

The oil magnate frankly told Mr. Ickes that the British are loading all 300 tankers obtained from the United States in the Dutch West Indies, which involves a much longer round trip to England than if they were loaded at North Atlantic ports.

Of course, the British are interested financially in the oil refineries of the Dutch West Indies which took them over after the defeat of Holland. The companies operating these refineries are nominally Dutch but in reality are owned by the Royal Dutch Shell.

Thus, Britain *buys South American oil, refines the oil in West Indian refineries, and ships the oil in our American tankers!*

Secretary Ickes was urged to demand that the British tankers take on oil at North Atlantic ports. Two hundred tankers could deliver the same oil to Britain from North Atlantic ports as 300 tankers are now delivering from the West Indies.

The remaining hundred tankers could then be used in a shuttle service between the Dutch West Indies and North Atlantic ports with replacement oil.

If this shuttle service was adopted, the oil magnate told Ickes, the 100 tankers "will deliver 20-million barrels per month on the Atlantic seaboard, 10-millions of which would be available for shipment overseas. No disturbance occurs to the existing production of finished products at the refineries, north of Hatteras."

Incidentally, this would eliminate any shortage and any necessity for Mr. Ickes' unpopular rationing.

* * *

In replying to the oil magnate, Mr. Ickes is said to have conceded that if adequate supplies of oil were available at North Atlantic refineries, a "great saving in tank tonnage" could be made.

Mr. Ickes insisted, however, that finished products there available are barely enough to take care of domestic needs and predicted that a serious East Coast shortage is in sight in view of the British aid effort.

Of course, the Petroleum Commissar could uncap a lot of wells capped by Government order in the oil districts. He could eliminate immediately the "hot oil" situation. This oil could easily be transported over land. For, despite Ickes' warning, there is no shortage of railroad locomotives in this country, nor tank cars nor workmen of experience.

Furthermore, Mr. Ickes could study the petroleum transportation problem before relaying any more American tankers and supplying all of Britain's allies with oil.

Now that Soviet Russia and Great Britain are allies, Britain certainly ought to be able to obtain the same amount of oil from Russia as Germany received when she was Stalin's ally.

Since Britain, too, has seized absolute control of Iraq, the British ought to be able to guarantee a steady flow of oil to Haifa from the Mosul fields.

Oil Commissar Ickes ought to realize that Americans can recognize that this is simply another commercial oil war, and that intelligent Americans are not willing to deprive themselves of the necessities of life and of proper living, to "sacrifice" and suffer for a double-crossing empire and a Christian-killing Communist dictatorship.

Not Always Inefficiency

IT MAY not always be British inefficiency. The efficiency of the Bank of England—not always English, either—sometimes lays plans that merely seem inefficient because we regard them as the reasoned policy of a national government.

But, behind the scenes, for the bankers' purposes, the scheme is diabolical efficiency — it was, as the saying is, "planned that way."

A recent speech by Mr. Morgan in the Australian House of Representatives, re-

(Continued on Page 11)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

(Continued from Page 10)

ported by *Hansard* (Australian equivalent of our *Congressional Record*) may be very enlightening to shipping executives, and others, who are confused and bewildered by British maritime policies of the sort reported in the preceding comment.

We quote from the Australian *Hansard*:

"On his return to Australia, the Prime Minister assured the country that no vested interest would be permitted to impede a total war effort . . . Everybody was pleased to hear that announcement even though it may have been in the nature of a deathbed repentance . . . He delivered what he very properly described as a *prospectus*. Upon examining the *prospectus*, we have no difficulty in ascertaining the identity of those who prepared it. Obviously, it is in effect a Bank of England *prospectus*, and the principal participants in this country are the Baillieu group and the monopolistic interests which support the government!

"An examination of the part played by the Bank of England in the present war *reveals the guilty men who are responsible for the present perilous position of the British Empire!*

"Before I deal with that subject, I shall make further reference to the Bank of England, the part it played in bringing about the war, and its responsibility for placing Great Britain in such a position where it may yet encounter defeat. The following article recently appeared in the press:

" 'Shipping Sell-Out Between the Wars.

" 'Industrial sins of British ship-builders in the between-wars period are recalled by many writers just now, when the situation is that the Germans have been able to sink British shipping three times as fast as British shipyards could replace it. When world trade languished in the big depression, and ocean shipping was laid up, big interests in Britain resolved to "stabilize" by forming the combine called National Shipbuilders Securities.

" 'The method was like the good old brick combine in New South Wales. The ring bought out shipyard after shipyard, and closed them down, so as to keep cozy dividends for the survivors from available freights. Worse than closing the yards, they razed them to the ground, clearing off buildings and plants! The sites were sold, or leased for long terms on covenants that they must never again be used for shipbuilding.

" 'The once busy shipyard town of Jarrow (to quote only one example) became virtually a piece of waste-land. From all shipyards, fully 15,000 expert shipwrights were dismissed and scattered, so that Ernest Bevin last year had immense trouble in tracing and collecting even half of them.

" 'Quantities of machinery laid idle and were sold to Germany! Result: The British began the war in 1939 with fewer ships than she had in 1914, and with only two-thirds the former capacity to replace sinkings. We behaved almost as badly in Australia. Walsh Island in New South Wales was dismantled and the great Commonwealth Line was sold off, at a bargain price, to a noble Lord who went to jail without paying for it.'

* * *

"The Bank of England's activities in financing National Shipbuilder's Securities were not confined to causing the partial destruction of the British shipbuilding industry," the Australian report continues.

"Even after Hitler had seized Czechoslovakia, the Bank endeavored surreptitiously to smuggle 6-million pounds' worth of Czech gold to that country. The Governor of the Bank, Mr. Montagu Norman, and his international financial friends, were responsible for that act.

"The Bank resolutely declines to publish the names of its shareholders. When members of the House of Commons recently requested the government to compel the disclosure of that information, it refused to do so. The reason was obvious. *Some of the shareholders are our enemies!*

"Worse than that, until the eve of the outbreak of war, the Bank of England was granting financial assistance to Hitler and was helping him to re-arm Germany for the purpose of fighting the British Empire while Britain's defenses were neglected. That is the institution behind the *prospectus* which the Prime Minister produced on his return to this country."

* * *

Just who the shareholders of the Bank of England are, we do not know. We do know that the Rothschilds are very conveniently the agents of the Royal Mint, and closely connected with the Bank of England.

Planned That Way

AN EDITORIAL in the *New York American*, November 5, 1935, said:

"President Roosevelt landed at Charleston after a prolonged meditation under the tropical moon, with an unusually luminous smile on his face, and gave utterance to this amazing statement to the tax-nonplussed South Carolinians: "We are coming back more soundly than ever before because we planned it that way. Don't let anyone tell you differently."

Sometime prior to that famous statement, in the early part of 1934, the country was stirred by the revelations of Dr. Wm. A. Wirt, inventor of the Gary, Indiana, school plan, an educator of national repute.

Dr. Wirt's sensational disclosure had to do with a dinner party which he had attended at a Virginia home near Washington, D. C. Dr. Wirt embodied his charges in a letter to the *Committee of the Nation* in New York, which published them and the doctor was requested to appear before a Congressional Committee to investigate his charges.

Dr. Wirt was not allowed counsel, nor was he permitted to cross-examine witnesses, nor was he called in rebuttal after his statements had been dismissed with sweeping denials. In other words, the investigation was a white-wash! Dr. Wirt is now dead but his charges viewed in retrospect stand out amazingly.

They were in substance as follows:

(1) Certain Brain Trusters had said in his presence that they planned to destroy the present form of government in the United States.

(2) By thwarting recovery they could promote economic changes that would convince the people that the central Government should take over everything.

(3) By having people borrow money from the Government, Uncle Sam would later have to assume control of business and property when payments could not be met.

(4) A statement had been made to him by certain Brain Trusters that "we believe we have Mr. Roosevelt in the middle of a swift stream," and "we all think he is only the Kerensky of this revolution," and can be supplanted by "a Stalin."

(5) The power of influencing the people by propaganda is being used as a science as in the war days.

(6) The press would have to "beg for mercy" by threats of censorship.

(7) Government loans were to be used to keep schools and colleges "in line."

(8) Money given to farmers as "doles" would keep them quiet until the job was finished.

(9) The object of the Brain Trusters was "nothing less than the overthrow of the whole existing order," Dr. Wirt revealed.

* * *

Dr. Wirt openly named Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace as one of the ringleaders of the group to put over this plan. Mr. Wallace is now Vice-President, chosen at the Chicago convention at the order of the President.

Dr. Wirt's charges—remember they were made in 1934—were more than prophetic — they hinted at least at a definitely planned blue-print!

Today, in 1941, the "plan" is clearer than ever. We see unelected bureaucrats and presidential appointees assuming powers over the Congress, even taking over Supreme Court functions as in the N.L.R.B. cases.

We see the Supreme Court turned into a Court of Men instead of a Court of Law.

We see central Government taking over more and more in every walk of life. Bishop Aloysius J. Muench of Fargo, S. D., addressing the American Catholic Societies at a youth mass meeting in New York on August 16th, said:

"Governmental control and regimentation are *winding their octopus tentacles tighter and tighter around every phase of our national life!* American democracy is development into totalitarian democracy."

Before 1940, the charge was on record that leaders of industry and labor, as well as the farmers, would be kept quiet by doles, loans and contracts. Now, this financial patronage is being continued on a still more lavish scale in the name of national defense!

* * *

Will anyone deny that propaganda issued by the New Deal has been as scientific as humanly possible?

Will anyone deny that schools and colleges — not to say churches — have been "kept in line" through financial loans and threats from their powerful creditors?

Will anyone deny that mass-picketing, sit-down strikes, anti-Government demonstrations—including attacks on police and property, open riots where Marxian and Moscow-trained leaders defied police and court orders—all have reached a new high in America since 1934?

Dr. Wirt is dead, but "the plan" he was privileged to hear discussed by a tight little set of "planners" was not dissipated by the Wirt smear.

Indeed, the innocent statement made by President Roosevelt to his friends in Carolina, seems to have been freighted with a fateful significance:

"We planned it that way. Don't let anyone tell you differently!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Answer to Critics of Archbishop Beckman

APPEARING in the public prints on August 6th, the statement of Dr. William M. Agar, acting on behalf of "*Fight for Freedom, Inc.,*" criticizing a radio address of His Excellency the Most Rev. Francis J. L. Beckman, Archbishop of Dubuque, is termed by the *Witness:*

". . . rash, and brash, mischievous and mistaken and misleading, groundless and unsubstantiated, uncourteous and ill-tempered and deplorable, unconstitutional and un-American."

The *Witness,* official organ of the Archdiocese of Dubuque, says (Aug. 14) editorially:

"The Agar statement was a tirade of abuse, destitute of logic and reason, argument and evidence. Unsubstantiated assertion and abuse amount to a declaration of bankruptcy in argument and logic, evidence and reason. The wild and whirling words of Mr. Agar, presumably and reputedly a cultured gentleman of impeccable good manners and fine taste, are inexplicable save on the supposition that he is a lineal descendant of his *Old Testament* namesake whose son was 'a wild man, his hand against all men,' or that he had been overcome by the heat and hysteria prevalent in New York and by the pressure of propaganda on the part of the multitudes of foreigners there whose hearts and interests are in Europe and who both — in the slang and in the English sense of the word — are crazy to go to war.

* * *

"To go to war unprepared is defeat, disaster, destruction, craziness and insanity," continues the editorial. "Witness Europe, conquered and under the heel of the Nazi; and Great Britain, sore-smitten because both went to war unprepared. *War-mongering unprepared is insanity and destruction.*

"Peace and preparedness constitute obviously the only sane and safe policy for America; and since the outbreak of war in 1939, that policy has been the program of Archbishop Beckman. Since 1939, his refrain has been, arm to the teeth; prepare.

"America is not prepared nor unified. Unification and preparation are essential to victory in war. And to say this is merely to repeat the theme song of every competent military expert.

"Incidentally, Archbishop Beckman was the first prominent American to denounce repeatedly and thunderously the Nazis and to declare their mortal menace.

"Of course, the Archbishop has never been anything like as furious and frantic for peace as the President in his promises and pledges therefor impassioned and perfervid, repeated and reiterated 'again and again and again' — before the election. Then the President was passionately for peace almost to the point of pacifism or peace at any price. The President was elected on his pledge and promise of peace. The Archbishop has been and is for peace, but not for peace at any price; he is not for peace where there is no peace; he is for preparedness always; he is for peace according to the Scripture which says, '*Seek after peace and pursue it.*' And '*In so far as in you lies, be at peace with all men.*'

* * *

"Being for peace and for preparedness now, Archbishop Beckman as an American and as a Catholic, as a patriot and as a high priest of the Prince of Peace is eternally right and the interventionists in seeking to precipitate America all unprepared into war and ruin are tragically and fatally wrong and deficient in sense, in patriotism, in Christian devotion to the cause of peace.

"The Christian principle prescribes war only when properly prepared and only to maintain rights and liberties. When that time comes, we shall go to war; war to the knife, to death, to the last ditch.

"Tell us, ye interventionists, what we shall go to war with and where? The Nazis control the European continent. The weapons and machines to wage war are lacking. There is only a one-ocean fleet. The army is woefully small and inadequate and untrained. With only this in the way of armament, to talk of invading here and now, Europe, Africa, Asia and attack the mightiest military machine in the tide of time is national suicide and nonsense; it is the height of hysteria and unreason and absurdity; it is emotion and sentiment run mad.

"Hoover shows we are waging war and helping Britain far more effectively now than pushing unprepared into the colossal conflict. Why paralyze our effort and hamstring our aid to Britain and involve us with Japan and a two-ocean war with a one-ocean navy, ye immediate interventionists, by rushing us into an all-out, total, limitless shooting war? The strategy of hysterical old women is yours.

"Really, Mr. Agar, even a majority of four to one, as the polls show, for peace against a small and insolent, silly and abusive, hysterical and minuscule minority has some rights. New York is not America; indeed, New York is not America; it never was; it is and always has been mainly foreign and colonial. New York — speaking by and large — never seems to have heard of the *Declaration of Independence.* Even an Archbishop, too, has a right, Mr. Agar, to some minimum and modicum of courtesy and consideration.

"The *Constitution,* remember, Mr. Agar, not the Archbishop, says the Congress, not an officious and presumptuous minority, shall have the right of declaring war.

"To take the right of declaring war away from Congress is the destruction of democracy and the supersession of the *Constitution* by a dictatorship pure and simple; by a one-man Government. What rights have the People anyhow if they haven't the right of declaring war through their duly elected and thoroughly informed representatives?

"In denouncing the supersession of the *Constitution* by dictatorship and despotism — the suggestion had come from a high place — the Archbishop rendered a public service of no small proportions.

* * *

Defending the Archbishop's charge of "coddling Communists," the *Witness* editorial says: "The presence and numerousness of Communists in high places in the Government and their coddling by it *constitute a monstrous and enormous grievance and a colossal scandal.*

"The Communists have been coddled ever since the Administration went into power and — to the detriment of American interests — immediately recognized Communist Russia and permitted that capital of Communism to set up nests of conspiracy against America and civilization; and in those nests the Communists have constantly conspired against American institutions, investigation discloses.

"Communists are sworn enemies of American and free institutions and determined to erect on their ruins of civilization a super savage and sanguinary slavery and Soviet . . .

"Communism is a monkey-wrench thrown into American machinery of production and defense and a wrecking crew without peer, and Communism has been coddled unquestionably and incontestably by the Administration. Communism is slavery and savagery.

"If the Archbishop had not cried out against the Communist taint in the Government, the very stones would have cried out.

"Instead of being coddled, Communists should be kicked out of the country, bag and baggage!"

* * *

Criticism of the President by honest Americans is a better service to the nation and a truer friendship to the Executive than the counsel of fawning sycophants who are guiding him to ruin, declares the Archbishop's editor.

"Just as a cat may look at a king, so the *Constitution* holds any American has a right and even a duty to criticize a President when he is failing in a charge of crucial, and commanding importance such as defense," the *Witness* continues.

"Defense is bogging down ominously and appallingly. By the strikes they instigated, the Communists have inflicted millions and millions and millions of hours' loss on defense. Defense is away behind schedule. Defense is bogging down. Defense is in a snarl, in a state of confusion and chaos . . .

"Sycophancy is the curse of Church and State. Nothing is more dangerous than for a man in high place to be surrounded by sycophants and servile flatterers who delude the dignitary to his ruin. 'Now you have heard the truth for the last time,' remarked an old priest to Cardinal Manning on the occasion of his elevation to the Archbishopric of Westminster. The frank are the best friends of a dignitary; the flattering are his worst foes.

"*The brave men who tell the President the truth and even point out the dangerous faults of his administration and their correction are his best friends;* the servile flatterers and fawning sycophants who pay court to him and flatter and adulate him, kowtow and burn incense before him, idolize him and tell him he can do not wrong are his worst enemies. They are ruining him; his candid critics are his best allies.

"A great man," continues the *Witness,* "surrounds himself with great men, because he is not afraid of being overshadowed; small men in high place surround themselves with littler men because they are afraid of being overshadowed.

(Continued on Page 13)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

(Continued from Page 12)

"Lincoln was a great man because he chose for his cabinet great men who were his rivals like Seward and Chase and his great Secretary of War, Stanton, who was waspish and repellent in personality and hostile to his chief.

"Frederick, miscalled the Great, was a failure as an executive because of his dictatorial and meddlesome spirit. No man can do everything; he must organize, delegate, deputize, supervise.

"Failure to organize the American productive plant and enlist American organizing genius threatens dire disaster.

' ' '

"The Archbishop presented and praised Father Coughlin, Mr. Agar objects. And why not, indeed?

"Father Coughlin was never convicted of any crime.

"Father Coughlin is a priest of stainless record.

"Father Coughlin is a priest in good standing.

"Father Coughlin has done more to popularize the social encyclicals of the Popes than any other man in America.

"Father Coughlin is the greatest of American orators.

"Father Coughlin is a useful citizen of signal public service. His great voice beat the dictatorship bill. Father Coughlin is a man of genius.

"Yes, Mr. Agar, the Archbishop is a friend of Father Coughlin and was long before he was known to fame, and the Archbishop is loyal to his friends, even when the pack turns on them. He is the last man to desert a friend in need and throw him to the wolves. Courage and loyalty are rare virtues these days.

"Lastly, poll-parroting *Time*, Mr. Agar tries to smear as 'Christian Front-Social Justice patter' some observations of the Archbishop on the economic-financial aspects of the war and shows thereby that he himself is a victim of shallow and transparent smearing.

"Why, it is a notorious and incontestable historical fact that international bankers, mainly located at London and aided and abetted by New York bankers, actually financed Hitler and the Nazi armament and promoted Prussian aggression and violation of treaty and are principally responsible for the devastation and ruin, war and woe that the Nazis have inflicted on the world.

"The foregoing fact has appeared scores of times in *The Weekly Review*, ablest and most intelligent of English periodicals. That fact has been repeated again and again and again in the columns of *The Witness*.

"That fact is a notorious and incontestable historical fact and not the private property of Father Coughlin, nor of SOCIAL JUSTICE, nor of the Christian Front.

' ' '

"Thus, it will be seen that all the charges made against the Archbishop on the score of his recent utterances dissolve into thin air and turn out upon examination to be mere carping and caviling and captious catching at syllables and words and tearing them out of their proper context. Examining the pattern of the discourses of the Archbishop since the appearance of the world crisis in 1939, we discern him to be consistently rational and right and his carpers and cavilers irrational and wrong."

Behind the War

Allies Broke Faith, Lloyd George Charges

THOSE honest persons who insist on adverting to the *primary cause* of the present war, and the *cause of Hitlerism,* are somehow regarded as disloyal, or at best, misguided Americans.

With the New Deal administration now officially committed to the destruction of Hitlerism — by invasion of Europe if necessary — and with the propaganda for active United States intervention growing bolder every day, those who dare blame anything but Hitler for the raging holocaust are subjected to bitter calumny.

Righteous, honest, Christian Great Britain, aided by Communist Russia, is fighting the battle for civilization and democracy and the sanctity of treaties. So it is said.

The United States must go all out in defense of Great Britain and Communist Russia. So it is said.

Britain is the "innocent victim of aggression," with no responsibility for the conditions which gave rise to Hitlerism. So it is said.

Those who point out that Britain and France are largely the victims of their own vindictiveness, greed, stupidity and dishonesty, are assailed as "pro-Nazi."

Bearing that in mind, one can almost afford the luxury of smugness as he quotes the words of the Hon. David Lloyd George, World War Prime Minister of Great Britain, and present Member of the British Parliament.

' ' '

In a speech in Commons on May 9, 1940, Mr. Lloyd George, Britain's representative at the Peace Conference at Versailles, declared:

"The *Treaty of Versailles* was not carried out by those who dictated it. A good deal of the trouble was due to that fact. We were dealing with governments in Germany which were democratic governments, based on a democratic franchise, with democratic statesmen, and *it is because we did not carry out the undertakings we had given to those democratic governments that Hitler came into power.* There was a good deal that was done in Germany, more particularly with regard to disarmament.

"The solid promise that we gave, not merely in the treaty itself but in a document which I took part in drafting, which was signed by M. Clemenceau on our behalf, that if Germany disarmed, we should immediately follow her example, *was not carried out, and there is no government that is more responsible for that than the present national government which came into power in 1931.*

"They had their opportunity. America was ready, Germany was ready — it was a time when Herr Bruening was in charge — but we refused to carry out the terms after Germany had been completely disarmed. We had the certificate of the ambassadors to say that disarmament was completed, but in spite of that we did not carry out our part.

' ' '

"The same thing applies to minorities. I repeatedly called attention to it. Mr. Benes, in the conference in Paris — I am sorry to have to go over this at the present moment, but I am not in the habit of failing to reply to attacks — was responsible, first of all, for giving a direct pledge to the conference that if Sudeten Germany were to become part of Czechoslovakia — the same thing applied to the Hungarians and to the Slovakians — the same autonomy would be given to them as in the Swiss Confederation of men of different races under the same flag and forming part of the same Federal Constitution. *It was not carried out!*

"The last conference I attended as Prime Minister was at Genoa in 1922, eight years after the signature of the *Treaty of Versailles.* I begged that the promises which had then been given to the minorities, to the Hungarians and to the Germans — the same thing applies to Poland and to the Ukrainians — should be carried out. It was not my fault that they were not carried out . . .

"Of course, as an independent member of this House I could not bring the same pressure as I did when I was Prime Minister, but I urged the conquering powers, who were then all-powerful, to exert their authority to compel these countries to carry out the pledge which they had given. I pointed out, over and over again, that if they did not do so it would end in a great European war and there would be trouble.

"My predictions, unfortunately, have turned out to be true, and when the history of the whole of these transactions comes to be written, if the honorable gentleman will take the trouble to read it, he will find that *most of this trouble has originated in the fact that the victors in the late war did not carry out solemn pledges which they gave in a treaty which they themselves dictated.*

"They had the opportunity. Germany was prostrate. The creation of this terrible power in Germany, the spirit which is behind it, and what makes it so formidable at the present moment is due to the fact that we did not carry out our pledges.

"What is the result? Democracy has been swept away in Germany; democracy has been attacked by Germany. That spirit in Germany was created by the fact that the dominating democracies in Europe did not keep faith.

"We are now confronted with the most terrible answer that has ever been given to those who have broken faith and broken covenants. I do not apologize in the least for the fact that not only when I was Prime Minister but afterward I did my very best to persuade them to carry out the pledges which they had given solemnly, in writing, to the world!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congressional Recordings

Rep. Voorhis Tells Congress About Money

DAILY PERUSAL of the *Congressional Record* discloses that Representative Jerry Voorhis of California is one of the few men still in Congress devoting much thought to the nation's No. 1 domestic problem — the dishonest money system.

With the exception of Wright Patman of Texas, Voorhis is virtually alone this session in pointing out the absurdity of a system under which private bankers are privileged to "create money by a stroke of the pen" and loan it to the sovereign Federal Government at interest.

Either because the eyes of the nation are focused on war, taxes and national defense, or because the subject is "unpopular," a recent Voorhis speech on the money question was given little, if any, attention by the press. Perhaps, the explanation is that exposures of the flagrant usury practiced under our monetary system are taboo in the free American press.

Mr. Voorhis told the House substantially what Father Coughlin and SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine have repeated to the point of monotony for several years — namely, that the American people are being deceived and exploited by the small *clique* of financiers who control the nation's credit.

* * *

Attacking the practice of Federal borrowing from private banks, Representative Voorhis explained how the system operates and why it is unjust.

"The Government gives a private bank or financial house an interest-bearing obligation of all the people of the nation," he said, "and the bank in exchange credits the Government on its books with a demand deposit, created out of thin air, based wholly upon the credit of the Government and its people and secured solely by the bond itself. The sovereign Government has, in such a case, induced a private profit-making agency to create the nation's money, or more accurately, to monetize the credit of the nation . . .

"I do not ask the House to take my word for this," Mr. Voorhis added, and then quoted Marriner Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, who admitted in a speech before the Ohio Bankers' Association in 1935 that private banks have usurped the all-important power of money creation.

Said Eccles: "There is no political or economic power more charged with the general or social interest than the power to increase or decrease the supply of money. If the sovereign authority delegates this power to a particular group or class in the community as it has done in large part in this country, it divests itself of a part of its effective sovereignty . . . The power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof has always been an attribute of a sovereign power. It was one of the first powers given to the Federal Government by the Constitutional Convention. The development of deposit banking, however, introduced into the economy numerous private agencies which have power to create and destroy money without being recognized as creators or destroyers of money by the Government or the people."

Another authority — if one were needed — is Lewis W. Douglas, formerly Director of the Budget, who wrote in a magazine article in 1935: "Banks, when they buy Government bonds, rarely pay for them with cash that someone has deposited in the bank. Instead they create a bookkeeping credit, against which the Government is entitled to draw . . . In a country in which more than 90 per cent of all business is done by the use of checks, there is no essential difference between the creation of bank deposits by fiat and the creation of printing-press money. Bank deposits — not currency — constitute our chief circulating medium."

Voorhis declared that at this critical time in America's history when vast, unprecedented expenditures are being made it is especially vital that Congress pursue a sound governmental policy regarding finance. Instead of borrowing money from private banks at interest, the Government should either issue its own money or borrow at no interest from a central bank owned by the Government, he said.

"And if the cry of 'printing press money' is raised," Voorhis went on, "all I have to say is that we have 'printing press money' now. Federal Reserve notes are not even lawful money. They bear upon their face the promise of the United States Governmnt to redeem them in lawful money which means they must be, not lawful money but private bank notes — which is indeed the fact. Here is a Government obligation of very far-reaching sort, requiring us to redeem private bank notes in spite of the fact that the Government has shorn itself of its power to create money and the banks have grabbed that power. I ask you, gentlemen, what indeed would the United States Government use to redeem outstanding Federal Reserve notes if it were demanded that it do so? And would it be 'printing press money' if the necessary lawful money were created under these circumstances?

"Any bank that buys a Government bond can use that bond to secure an issue of Federal Reserve notes if it needs them. It is just a little more roundabout method of securing some 'printing press money,' and the bankers get the advantage of the interest on the public bonds issued. That is all. No one ever cries 'printing press money' about this."

—*Philadelphia Record*

"As I was walking up the stair
I met a man who wasn't there,
He wasn't there again today;
O how I wish he'd go away!"

* * *

Admitting that without the proper control issuance of money by the Government alone would be disastrous, Mr. Voorhis pointed out that "the essential principle to prevent abuse and inflation is, of course, not to overuse the Government's natural and inherent power to create the money or credit of the nation. The essential thing is to use this power only to the extent that economic circumstances require and justify that it be used in order to maintain the stable buying power of the nation's money and thus prevent the colossal economic injustices that occur when money fluctuates in value. Such a control would be far simpler and easier to apply than attempts to control an inflation of private bank credit, if it ever got started, for there simply is no way to effectively control an inflation of such private bank credit so long as the banks enjoy the privilege of multiple expansion on the basis of fractional cash reserves."

It is Voorhis' contention that the volume of money in circulation must have a more or less constant ratio to the volume of business and production if people are to prosper—that, for example, a 4 per cent increase in the nation's commerce should be accompanied by a 4 per cent increase in new money. That money should be issued by the Government, debt free, not borrowed from private banks who create it by a bookkeeping entry, he asserted.

If there are objections to printing new money the same principle could be employed by another method, he said. The latter would involve Government purchase of the capital stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, transforming them into a central bank of the United States.

When sound policy dictated the necessity for expansion of money or credit, the Treasury Department could issue bonds — interest bearing or non-interest bearing — and "sell" them to the central United States bank in the same manner that it now sells interest bearing bonds to privately owned banks.

"If the bonds bore interest," Voorhis explained, "then one Government agency, the Treasury, would be paying that interest to another Government agency, the national central bank, and at the end of each year the profits would come back to the Treasury and the interest paid would be part of them. If the bonds did not bear interest, they would amount simply to receipts given by the Treasury to the central bank to show that the central bank had created credits for the national use.

"It is wrong and ridiculous and dangerous for any central bank to be a private institution. As long as they are private institutions they will view their business from the standpoint of the banks who deal in money as a commodity and they will never view it from the standpoint of the general welfare of and sound policies for the nation."

Evidence of that was seen in France, Voorhis indicated, when the privately owned Bank of France — the nation's central bank — "refused to discount the Government's obligations or to provide it with any advances and this rendered impossible any sort of recovery. Undoubtedly that accounted for much of France's unprepared-

(Continued on Page 15)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

(Continued from Page 14)

ness and quick collapse under the Nazi blitzkrieg.

* * *

"America's destiny," Voorhis concluded, "—— the future hope of our people depends on our vision, our courage, and willingness to strike at privilege which is unreasonable and unjustifiable on any grounds whatsoever — the usurped privilege of private financial institutions to write upon their books the credit of the whole American people and sell it back to them with usury."

Although the nation is now concentrating on expansion of war production, and on means of paying the bill as far as possible through increased taxes, the duty of Congress, Mr. Voorhis asserted, "is the duty of indicating to the people that we can and will establish a nation in which people can consume as they produce, a nation in which there shall be a market at home for what the farmers and the workers and the businessmen can produce, a nation that can be independent economicaly, and follow such course as it sees fit to follow. And this principle that I am speaking of is the key to reducing the public debt and becomes even more important as we face the necessity of preventing a period of vast deflation and more widespread farm distress and unemployment than we have ever known before, when this defense period is over."

Bankruptcy Certain, Roosevelt Warned

AT THIS cross-road in American history, when the fate of the nation depends upon which course we shall take — the road to peace and at least an opportunity to try for prosperity, or the road to war and certain ruin — it may be idle to recall a few truths spoken in years past by President Roosevelt.

We say it may be idle to recall them, because they have long since been forgotten, or neglected, by the President and his advisors, and by a majority of the Congress.

We present them merely to emphasize how far the New Deal Administration has strayed in its fiscal policies from what the American people were led to expect on the basis of Mr. Roosevelt's laudable statements and promises in 1932 and 1933.

Be it remembered that the Federal debt, today, is more than $50-billion, that it soon will be $65-billion, that expenditures for the current fiscal year will be approximately $22-billion, and that there is no end in sight for this unprecedented spending.

Be it remembered also that even before the present war and national defense program was initiated, the Roosevelt Administration had nearly doubled the national debt.

When the New Deal took over in 1933 it inherited an indebtedness of about $22½-billion from the Hoover regime. At the end of the 1940 fiscal year, the debt had reached $43-billion. By July, 1941, according to the Treasury Department, the debt was $48,961,000,000! The deficit for the current year alone is expected to total $12-billion or more.

* * *

Now let us hark back to the Franklin D. Roosevelt of 1932. On October 12 of that year, campaigning for the Presidency, he wisely said:

"The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

"If Government lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; *if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.*"

* * *

Mr. Roosevelt in those days, you see, was greatly concerned over the spending of the Hoover Administration — spending which was quickly dwarfed by the unparalleled New Deal expenditures.

In his message to Congress in March, 1933, President Roosevelt declared:

"For three long years, the Federal Government has been on the road to bankruptcy.

"For the fiscal year 1931 the deficit was $462-million.

"For the fiscal year 1932 it was $2,472,000,000.

"For the fiscal year 1933 it will probably exceed $1,200,000,000.

"For the fiscal year 1934, based on the appropriation bills passed by the last Congress and the estimated revenues, the deficit will probably exceed $1-billion unless immediate action is taken.

"Thus we shall have piled up an accumulated deficit of $5-billion.

"With the utmost seriousness I point out to the Congress the profound effect of this fact upon our national economy. It has contributed to the recent collapse of our banking structure. It has accentuated the stagnation of the economic life of our people. It has added to the ranks of the unemployed. Our Government's house is not in order and, for many reasons, no effective action has been taken to restore it to order.

"Upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rests the safety of deposits, the security of insurance policies, the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of our agricultural products, and the availability of employment.

"The credit of the United States Government definitely affects these fundamental human values. It, therefore, becomes our first concern to make secure the foundation. National recovery depends on it.

"Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger."

* * *

How did Mr. Roosevelt, when he became President, proceed to avoid this danger?

He didn't.

Alarmed over a $5-billion Hoover deficit incurred in a period of four years, Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal embarked on a spending orgy the like of which this nation had never seen. And now even that peacetime spree which failed to solve the unemployment problem, has been itself dwarfed by the war program.

Where will it all end?

Possibly the President himself is as competent an authority as any to judge the effect, the ultimate result, of such spending.

Remember his warning of 1932 — that if a government "extends its taxing power to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy."

Rooseveltisms—1932

"LET US have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits. Stop the deficits. Let us have equal courage to reverse the policy of the Republican leaders and insist on a sound currency . . .

"I call attention in my address at Pittsburgh on Wednesday night to the great importance of Federal Budget making as the foundation of the national credit. I pointed out that the Hoover administration had been responsible for deficit after deficit; that as one disastrous year succeeded another, no attempt was made to arrange the finances of the country so that at least the mounting loss of revenue might not be turned into a deficit for the next year. It is my pledge and promise that this dangerous kind of financing shall be stopped, and that rigid governmental economy shall be forced by a stern and unremitting administration policy of living within our income."

—President Roosevelt in a speech at Albany, July 30, 1932

Who Said It?

I HAVE always said that if Great Britain were defeated in war, I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among the nations.

—Winston Churchill in 1938

* * *

If another war comes and the history of it is ever written, the dispassionate historian a hundred years hence will not say that Germany alone was responsible for it, even if she strikes the first blow, but that those who mismanaged the world between 1918 and 1937 had a large share of the responsibility for it.

—The late Lord Lothian, former British ambassador to the United States; in 1938

* * *

We must be safe from undue foreign pressure . . . We cannot confine the safety of our country to the passions or the panic of any foreign nation which may be facing some desperate crisis . . . *All history has proved the peril of being dependent upon a foreign State for home defense instead of upon one's own right arm.*

—Winston Churchill in 1934

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters

SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent to SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.

A Letter From Camp

TO THE EDITOR:

I felt lucky today, got two letters from home at the same time. We boys sure look forward to letters. Especially do we like to have letters waiting for us after maneuvers. It kind of gets us down for always some boys get killed, but you seldom see it in the newspapers—and the Army rules keep it all quiet.

One of my friends in another company was killed in the truck accident I told you about. They reported six killed, but we know it was more. You asked me, or Mother did, how so many boys get killed. Well, it is just dumbness. Men fall off trucks, trucks turn over, but the worst is that too many are killed by being run over while they are sleeping on the ground! Don't worry about me though, I sleep under the trees, and the trucks are not so likely to come close to them.

Our early maneuvers were very funny; but, of course, we're improving. Some of the officers got lost from the men; two supply men were put off at the wrong place with our sleeping bags, and we couldn't locate them so slept without 'em. Finally, they found us; they had walked 23 miles and were plenty mad!

The sham battles are a riot! They have one man at the top. They plan the result, and in case things don't go the way they plan it, they "stop the war," instead of letting them fight it out. It would surely be a crime to go up against any foe as poorly trained as this outfit is.

What this Army needs is a school to train officers. Their first year should be just like ours, as you cannot lead people who know more than you do. I have seen Boy Scout hikes planned better than these maneuvers.

I get a kick out of them wanting to extend our time, as we do not have enough equipment for the men already in. Our company goes out with wooden guns. We haven't a single piece of combat equipment or anything that is up-to-date. I guess they are still sending it all to England.

They have been searching our mail for Communistic literature, and we have been told that we would be courtmartialed if any such literature was found in our possession; now Washington wants us to fight for the Communists!

I honestly think the reason they cut down the age limit was because they like to have kids who are easy to pull around and who won't ask too many embarrassing questions. If you don't swallow all the bunk they tell you, they say you are a "trouble-maker."

Don't worry about me, I'll get along.

— 1941 Doughboy.

Soldiers Must Not Know Facts

TO THE EDITOR:

I had already been in the Massachusetts National Guard for more than a year before the war-makers' dream of a *Selective Service Act* came true. In other words, I was not drafted.

Since I am in the Medical Corps, and have a chance to care for sick soldiers, I have a grand opportunity to interview men from different outfits. I also have a chance to get acquainted with the Selectees . . .

You see, these boys had a job; most of them were pretty well settled in life. To suddenly change them from this sort of life by a "scare" of national danger, and place them in the Army — when there is actually no crisis for the U.S.A. if we'd mind our own business — will affect an individual, especially if he is placed in some "tough" unit of infantry.

This regimented change ruins a person's morale. An army can function efficiently only when the morale is kept up. Great pains are taken to see that the men's morale is not shaken, as you can notice by reading the newspapers, or attending your movie theater.

One step was banning SOCIAL JUSTICE from distribution at the Army posts. SOCIAL JUSTICE will "collapse the morale" that is being built up in this Army, because you expose the aims of the international war-makers.

Yet if one wishes to be *an American soldier* he ought to have access to all the facts there are. Therefore, SOCIAL JUSTICE would help to make men good *American soldiers.*

President Roosevelt is smart. He knows that the war-mongers, though influential, are few. He knows the boys we drafted do not want to fight England's war. So, the administration is doing everything possible to stop a "regimenting" of non-interventionist groups against the pet crusade for Britain.

We who are in the Army are no longer in a position to speak for our rights. Military laws, you know —in fact I could be courtmartialed for writing this letter. It's up to the rest of you from here on.

— An American Soldier.

Packed With Facts

TO THE EDITOR:

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on the last few editions of SOCIAL JUSTICE. They have certainly packed a lot of educational facts.

You will no doubt be glad to know that my brothers and myself buy extra copies of SOCIAL JUSTICE and give them to friends.

May Almighty God bless Father Coughlin and SOCIAL JUSTICE, which is fighting so hard to save our boys from the holocaust of war.

— A.J.H.

Brooklyn, New York

Secret Stuff!

—Fitzpatrick in St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Internationalists Have No Patriotism

TO THE EDITOR:

When Czechoslovakia, Poland, France, Belgium and the Netherlands were invaded, those in power fled to London and, from a place of safety for themselves, appealed to the peoples they had deserted to "fight on."

From their places of safety for themselves they are now asking the peoples they left behind to rebel against the patriotic and loyal leaders who remained at home to defend their country when it was in peril, and to assist the needy and wounded, and to restore order as best they were able to do under the circumstances.

Many of these refugee internationalists have come to America and were given professorships in American colleges; or are engaged in lecturing to propagandize Americans; others were given profitable positions, even displacing native Americans; others were given movie and radio contracts; others are busy clipping coupons—but all of them are trying to incite peace-loving Americans to hate their pet foes—and what is more, to fight their war of hate and revenge for them.

Meanwhile, they are waiting like vultures to grab position, power and influence in our American Government, business and professions—when Congress can be induced as their willing dupes to send American boys to a European war that these internationalists have run away from!

These internationalists possess no patriotism for any land. Always, they have gathered up the gold and other transportable wealth of every land and then fled. Now they ask that the loyal, patriotic nationals whom they have plundered be starved. They parrot what the war-planners want them to say, even when it affects their own people.

They are renegades who are concerned only with their own hides and their own comfort. Let them be known!

— One of the 80 Per Cent.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Interrupted Lives

TO THE EDITOR:

I am the mother of two beautiful daughters, one of whom has had to part with a fine type of young man. They were to have been married this Summer but the draft came along and nothing could be done, so he was taken off to camp, just as he was getting a good start in life.

His poor mother is heartbroken; after caring for him and bringing him up, to have him taken from her as a target for unknown guns.

It is the poor mothers and fathers of draftees who will suffer, paying taxes for somebody's ambition to dictate the future control of Europe.

Certainly our fine American children have a right to a happy life, but they cannot have it while the international war-mongers are destroying it.

My husband and I agree with all your articles in SOCIAL JUSTICE and hope you continue to tell the people the truth back of all this trouble.

— Mrs. W. J. McC.

Fitchburg, Mass.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters

How to Get Unity

TO THE EDITOR:

A united America will be achieved only when our public officials in Washington—the President, Vice President, and 531 Congressmen—elected and paid by the people, legislate and govern within the *Constitution* they swore to uphold, and in accordance with the wishes of a majority of the citizens of this Republic.

As paid servants of the people, this is their duty. This is the "American way;" this is American democracy, and guarantees liberty.

These 533 officials have no right to impose their secret will upon 130-million Americans, or to tell them what to do. This would be minority rule; Russian democracy—tyranny.

—J.P.

Malden, Mass.

Citizen Presents German Viewpoint

TO THE EDITOR:

I am now an American citizen, although I was born in Munich, Bavaria; in 1923 I came to Cleveland, Ohio, and have been a citizen of this great country since 1929.

I am directing these lines to you to let you know how I, and many other citizens of German extraction in America, feel and think.

I am a regular subscriber and reader of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine.

I find very little "social justice" in the world at the present time, especially in America; otherwise there would certainly be a fairer sense of justice towards the German people. Ridicule and hate are the principal motives which guide the press of our vast country.

There was no social justice after the murder in Sarajevo in 1914; neither was social justice established after the armistice.

It was likewise unjust to speak about the cruelties of the Germans in Poland, when the Poles during the period from 1918 up to the march of the Germans into Poland had brutally killed 57,000 persons!

In this country at the present time the propagandists are clamoring for help for England and the English prisoners, whereas groups of Germans and German prisoners are maltreated right here in America and Canada. And this injustice is done through the encouragement of anti-German propaganda in our free press. There is no justice, else England would not confiscate all possible mail which is addressed to Germany. Is protection in this great America to be accorded only to those who hail from England?

President Roosevelt is always stressing the fact that one "cannot trust" the Germans. But did not America under President Wilson in 1918 deceive the German people?

What is the content of those Fourteen Points?

And the new peace terms formulated by England and America have the same purpose as those in 1918; namely, to dismember Germany, in order that later on America might obtain and import cheap labor from Europe.

As a strict Catholic, I must admit that precisely here in the United States of America the practice of Christian religion and the influence of the Church are very superficial.

I believe that in America it has been forgotten that some years ago the theory was set up that the country which declares a war is "the guilty party." Both England and France declared war on Germany.

I am firmly convinced that Father Coughlin knows these historical facts a hundred times better than we. My own time and my labor is sacrificed in order to give my son the advantages of an education.

We have brought with us a heritage from the old country, which is unity, justice and freedom as a pledge for our happiness; consequently, let us all work together in harmony and fraternity, with heart and hand.

—A.W.

Cleveland, Ohio

It Has Been

TO THE EDITOR:

I have just received my bundle of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazines and have read Father Coughlin's radio speech of ten years ago. I think it is an excellent idea to feature these radio addresses of former years. This particular address is so timely, even now, that I believe it should be printed and distributed in pamphlet form.

—C.A.F.

Jamaica, N. Y.

Hitler Attack on Stalin Upset Another World Plot

TO THE EDITOR:

Ever since Hitler stuck his head over the horizon England and the United States Government have done everything in their power—and that was plenty—to get Dictator Stalin on their side. But Stalin chose Hitler.

Did Churchill and Roosevelt stop appeasing Stalin then? They did not. They continued to pour everything into Russia that Stalin wanted; and all the time Roosevelt, through Steinhardt, and Churchill, through Cripps, were getting closer and closer to Molotov, telling him that Russia "would be attacked next"—that Hitler needed wheat, minerals, etc.

Through Molotov, the two reached Stalin. He believed them and was for attacking Hitler at once. He massed all his armies on the Western Front and *it was all Cripps and Steinhardt could do to hold him off!*

Somewhere, some great "brain" working overtime, outlined this plan: Keep Stalin from going over the line against Hitler, and in due time—oh, it might be even two or three months more — and the United States could be brought into a shooting war with them.

But, first—and here was the great plot— agents made up of "the right people" must be sent into France, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and even Italy, to contact the "right people" there and to tell them at the right time, getting the right signal, when those countries should have all their "right people" informed and ready.

Meanwhile United States ships would sail with thousands of tons of military equipment for the benighted countries. She would convoy all those countless ships with her full naval forces. Land the supplies with thousands of American Marines ready to grab them and take them to the waiting masses of informed people under Hitler's control.

Then, Russia was to strike from the East; England from the North and South; the United States from the West and in no time, so to speak, they could all overcome Hitler, annihilate all Germany, kill every German if necessary, so that "peace and justice and democracy" could reign through the whole world, via Josef Stalin!

It was a great plot but it would need to be guarded carefully and kept very secret until the great moment for action by the "right people" arrived.

Now I don't say that Hitler knew or even sensed such a plot; but he did know that something was wrong. Stalin was holding out on him and he struck at once. Hence the blood-curdling shriek of anger from Churchill! The British leader had to crawl into the vermin bed with Stalin — else Molotov would tell the world about the whole conspiracy!

Do you find any weak links in my thesis?

—R.T.

Richmond, Va.

Any 'Honest Money' Must Have an Honest Value Unit

TO THE EDITOR:

"Honest money" is not enough; it must also be *intelligent, scientific money*. Honest fools have often wrecked the world worse than the greatest crooks.

We have been fed up with the kindergarten stuff on the money question: let's get practical!

Useful human work, or effort, physical, intellectual and spiritual, is the one and only source and origin of all useful goods and services—and, therefore, is it not the only cost and, equally, the only just and honest price?

Money is "honest," when it expresses this fact clearly and correctly and when the monetary unit, 1 or $1, represents a definite amount of such work, say the average physical and intellectual and spiritual performance, and is backed *by the useful products of such work* (real wealth).

If this is once understood, then we shall have no longer "Money-Changers," just as we have no longer yard-changers, pound-changers, quart or gallon-changers, or other tamperers with public standards of weights and measures.

The "Ghosts of Wall Street" will then be bereft of their "mysterious" shrouds, and stand naked before the public eye.

Money reform cannot hope to advance a single inch until the true nature and character of "money" (and wealth) is clearly understood, widely promulgated and honestly applied.

If I am at all rightly informed some such idea as: "Money equals human work" is now conquering the Eastern Hemisphere by storm; while we are marking time fruitlessly on the same spot, and even slide deeper into the mud of ever greater confusion.

Once the work-nature of wealth is understood, the creation of money by pen and ink would stop immediately, and so would its arbitrary cancellation. Everyone would know such ink money as so much counterfeit.

Nobody speaks of honest yards, quarts, pounds, hours, degrees, etc., any more. All we want to know is, are they scientifically correct?

If we have a correct and scientific *unit*, then we also have a correct and scientific and honest system. That follows automatically.

The honest yard, pounds, etc., solved all measuring questions. The scientific yard, stable itself at all times, measures the billion-fold variety of length problems, always correctly, whether big or small, up or down or sideways, straight or crooked, stable or unstable, hot or cold, always and everywhere and at all times.

So with the money unit and the everchanging variety of value problems.

We must simply have a stable *value unit* that applies everywhere, or the "money problem" will stay muddled through all eternity.

—H.T.H.

Milwaukee, Wisc.

Christians Too Meek

TO THE EDITOR:

Somehow we Christians are too meek. We are afraid to speak up. We lack the stamina to applaud in theaters for anti-war speakers in the news reels when they are flashed upon the screen; we are afraid to denounce publicly the aid-to-Britain song.

Let us bear in mind that it is only the brave who deserve to be free.

We can't accomplish much with talking, we need action. And, surely, if we have faith we will find some leaders who are still men enough, to hold justice above diplomacy, principles above policy and truth above consistency in our Congress and Senate.

They will demand that the 22-million voters of the last election are heard!

They will see to it that our boys are not being bred to create a docile expeditionary force for the King of England.

And they will see to it that America is actually *first*.

We need local offices throughout the nation, we need rabble rousing and plenty of it; in short, we need to create a voice so potent that we can in one cry destroy the negotiable pieces of paper that the monetary lords reign with, and end this confusion and deceit for all time to come.

—E.R.

San Francisco, Calif.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

A New Church —Stage and Altar

THE *Los Angeles Tidings,* official Catholic diocesan paper, contributes a provocative thought on modern church architecture.

It has resulted from the usury of our day.

Two weeks ago *Time* magazine published the picture of a new church and beneath it ran the following description.

"This is the first Roman Catholic church whose auditorium was deliberately built to be converted at will from a house of worship to a theater or recreation hall. Designed by its rector-founder, the Rev. Eugene J. Nolan, and dedicated last week in New York's suburbany Kew Gardens, the octagonal hall has its high altar on the north side, a fully equipped stage on the west. The other six sides have the baptistry, box office, shrines, side altar, kitchen, choir loft, confessional boxes. The seats face the sanctuary while Mass is being said, with curtains and sliding panels hiding all signs of secularity. When the play's the thing, the seats are turned to the stage and all religious equipment—from Stations of the Cross to holy-water stoups—is concealed."

* * *

And the *Tidings* comments:

"Looking at the picture the first thing one notices is that the altar is no longer in the center. It is at an angle to one side, and shares equal prominence with the stage, which is at the other side. This arrangement seems to set aside one of the oldest principles of church designing which ordains that the altar be the focal point of every line of church architecture. Theoretically, on entering a church the eye should find itself directed at once towards the altar.

"The lines of this new church are probably neutral in this regard. When a theatrical performance is being presented the stage will look as much at home as does the altar at times of worship, or maybe more so.

"A church so designed is, we believe, a very important event in the history of the Catholic Church in America.

"A breach has been made; a line pierced. What might be called the extraneous activities of the Church have at last invaded the sacred precincts. Pursuits that were regarded as makeshift and temporary have been given the permanent foundation of wood and stone in the House of the Lord.

"The church is a holy place; a place apart from the world," continues the *Tidings.* "Now this world has entered. Curtains or sliding panels may hide signs of secularity from the eye but not from the mind. And the passing vanity of men's dreams, reaching highest expression in the theater, must of necessity intrude themselves on the divine and eternal truths.

"A compromise is made here; an ideal is shattered.

* * *

"Somewhere far back, very far back it seems now, there was a feeling generally understood and accepted that all these activities, theatrical productions, bazaars, bingo and barbecues, were only grudgingly accepted to meet an emergency.

"The crisis was financial debt. Money had to be raised to meet it. So it was thought, let us make a great effort. The more quickly it is raised the more quickly we will realize our ideal. We will not have to worry about the pressure of banks. We will be free for the pursuit of spiritual things.

"This was the ideal but somehow it has faded a little. The *means,* which were supposed to be only temporary, have gotten permanently tangled up in the *end.*

"It is part of the truth of life that every end is conditioned by the means used to reach it. We see it clearly in larger issues. There is the old saying that preparation for war is a means towards peace. We know only too well today that preparation for war can only bring war. The means replace the end. The only way to achieve peace is not to prepare for war but to prepare for peace.

"In the same way, great insistence on the material to achieve spiritual ends will result in the material occupying too prominent a place.

"Put on shows to reduce church debt and you are liable to end up with a stage in church!

* * *

"There is also, it seems, a kitchen in this building, and that is fitting because the Church has gone in a good deal for the catering business, too. So much so that historians, looking back on our age, may wonder why, in view of all these activities, we were so illogical as to keep aspirants to the priesthood for six years in a seminary. Three might be enough, and the other three spent profitably acquiring useful knowledge, one in a restaurant, one in a bank, and one as ticket manager in some kind of a carnival.

"One must not be too idealistic, however, about such matters. After all with everybody's house in debt it may be a good thing to keep the House of the Lord in debt too. Otherwise people might get the impression that He was an 'economic royalist,' or a foreigner, or something.

"Even admitting this however it is going rather far to make the Lord a mere part-time boarder in His own House.

"Surely there are enough people mad at the banks already."

* * *

It is regrettable that St. Bingo is more popular in some dioceses than is St. Francis, the poor man.

It is saddening that so much emphasis is placed in our pulpits on the debt we owe bankers while so little emphasis is placed on the debt we owe God and our neighbor.

Usury — against which so few sermons are preached—is an evil which is transforming churches into gambling joints and sanctuaries into moving picture theatres.

The *Los Angeles Tidings* "has something" in the comment reproduced above.

8-Point Program Disappoints English

DISPATCHES from abroad report that the British people were disappointed at the Roosevelt-Churchill declaration. They had been led to believe the United States was ready to plunge headlong into Britain's war, and therefore, the English were expecting much more than the 8-point program for a future world outlined by the leaders of the two governments.

Many were anticipating a virtual declaration of war by Mr. Roosevelt.

This state of mind had been created not alone by remarks of Prime Minister Churchill, who has repeatedly told his people that the United States was on the very verge of war, but also by news dispatches filed by English correspondents in America.

The *London Pictorial Magazine,* for example, told its readers some weeks ago:

"You ask when will the United States declare war? John Walters, our New York correspondent, says within 6 months . . .

"The big battle of this war is raging at this moment on the streets of America . . .

"It is a battle between those who want America to come into the war now on the side of democracy and those who want to keep out. A battle between Roosevelt and Lindbergh . . .

"And until this battle of the Yanks is decided it (help) will never come.

"But now I can jump off the fence and proclaim this:

" 'I say that America will go to war with Germany.

" 'I believe that a complete state of war will be reached in stages, starting within the next few days with United States convoys in the Atlantic.

" 'Whether or not these convoys clash with Nazi naval forces, I believe that American opinion will consolidate into a united demand for an all-out fight with the Axis.

" 'My prediction is that war will have to be declared within the next 6 months.'

"Leading military and naval experts in Washington are saying openly that methods short of war are not enough.

"They insist that only an all-out effort by belligerent America can assure success in the battle of the Atlantic and doom Hitler to destruction."

* * *

In connection with that account in the *London Pictorial Magazine,* read to the Senate by Senator Gerald K. Nye of North Dakota, Senator Burton K. Wheeler produced a report from a British major to a member of Parliament. The major, after traveling throughout the United States on a propaganda mission, asserted that "the center of the war effort appears to be over here."

He described Secretary of War Stimson as *"a very decent, honest pro-British man,"* said that Secretary of the Navy Knox "is passionately anxious for America to come into the war at once," and characterized President Roosevelt as "the greatest dictator of all times."

"Everything is in his hands," the major wrote. "Clause No. 4 of the *Lend-Lease Bill* gives the President, and the President alone, complete and absolute power of determination how we shall pay for everything we get from the 'States' in the future."

In the Administration view it is un-American for United States citizens to describe Col. Stimson as "pro-British," or to accuse Knox of war mongering. But the British know.

Do they also have more information concerning United States plans to enter the war than the American public has? It would seem so.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

Catholic Views Catholic

HAROLD CALLENDER, *New York Times* staff writer, contributed a lengthy article to his newspaper (August 3rd) captioned *"Latin Catholics Suspicious of U.S."*

Mr. Callender, having spent four months in South America, discovered that Catholics there are not only suspicious of the United States but of the Catholics in this country, as well.

His contacts were Cardinals, priests, monks and outstanding lay leaders. He said:

"All, without exception, confirmed the existence of the suspicions mentioned and generously devoted considerable time in helping the visitor to understand them."

He added: "Certain of the Catholic leaders thought it highly desirable that these facts be made known and the suspicions removed if possible."

Speaking of Peru, the *New York Times* correspondent quoted a scholarly Peruvian who observed: "The church here is much like the church in Spain, hence the leanings toward the Franco regime and the Salazar dictatorship in Portugal."

From Chile he brought the report: "In the industrial north of Chile the trend is radical, in the south, Catholic. The Conservative party here is Catholic save on social questions . . . (North) Americans who come here find the philosophy of the left parties much nearer their own than that of the die-hard Catholic Conservatives. So even American priests are regarded as not quite Catholic, or as representing a form of Catholicism not desired here . . . The Conservatives here dislike democracy and want a Chilean Franco to suppress the Popular Front . . ."

* * *

As for the Argentine, Mr. Callender said:

"In Argentina there are twenty-two bishops, two being Italian, eleven of Italian descent, two of French descent, one of German and one of English ancestry.

"Priests and laymen are less anti-German than anti-English," according to a distinguished priest.

He added—quoting an eminent layman: "Many Catholics here are predisposed toward fascism because they like order."

One of the highest Catholic authorities in Buenos Aires when asked why there was antipathy to the United States among Catholics, said: "We have no special relations with United States Catholics, and there is no need for any."

As for Brazil, we are informed that, "Many Catholics here are anti-liberal and pro-totalitarian."

* * *

It is interesting to read the above digest of Mr. Callender's report of his visit to South America.

It would be still more interesting to obtain a report from the Catholics in Spain, Portugal, Italy, France, Germany and other countries relative to their attitude to the American Catholics who are divided so shamefully today.

As yet, the Freemasons in the United States have not officially and publicly endorsed a shooting war; have not officially and publicly endorsed all aid for Communist Russia; have not officially committed themselves to any proposition that Naziism is a worse enemy to civilization than is Communism.

The same can be said for Jewish religionists—although it is suspected that both Freemasons and Jews, privately, may entertain that thought.

Although the Catholic Church has not given public, official expression to either side of the question, nevertheless, the leading Catholic lay organization in America, by its applause of Associate Justice Murphy's speech at Atlantic City (August 19th), has endorsed the proposition that Naziism is Christianity's enemy number one.

This confusion caused by asinine debating as to whether Communism or Naziism is "Enemy No. 1" is pure persiflage and buncombe!

It's like debating which is the greater sin—murder or adultery—and choosing to play ball with the latter.

The point is: *both are intrinsically wrong* and you cannot commit adultery to avoid committing murder. Nor can you wed Communism to strafe Naziism.

Many individuals disagreed with the thoughts recently expressed by Bishop Hurley. The same individual Catholics disagreed with the lecture delivered by Justice Murphy before the Knights of Columbus national convention.

If he wants to be considered "neutral" on this subject of Naziism versus Communism, Archbishop Mooney should now attend some public meeting of Catholics who are *opposed to any co-operation whatsoever with Communist Russia.*

As for Associate Justice Frank Murphy, he has long been considered as a hopeless case, particularly from the time he delivered the address at the Yeshiva College in which he expressed so many heretical and outrageous propositions.

The New Deal and the 8-Hour Day

SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, revealed the intentions of the New Deal towards the 8-hour day, and other social gains made by labor throughout the past years.

He said that social gains, and everything else, "must yield to the re-armament effort." Specifying what he meant by "social gains," he called for the suspension of the 40-hour work-week and the substitution of a full-week working basis.

More than that, he indirectly predicted that union contracts, shop stewards and labor functionaries in general would be cashiered when he asserted that "the entire defense program should be placed under a single head."

Last week's SOCIAL JUSTICE announced the appointment of this "single head." He is Judge Samuel Irving Rosenman, prominent Jewish jurist whom Mr. Roosevelt already has chosen to act as commissar of labor and production.

A similar *technique* was followed in England several months ago.

First, the 8-hour day was abolished.

Second, overtime pay and stipulated salaries were abolished.

Not many moons hence, this second incident will follow the abolition of the 8-hour day in America.

The multitude of American C.I.O.-ists and A.F. of L.-ists will put little credence in this statement. Again we say: "Wait and see."

The Rev. David C. Colony Writes a Letter

THE RECTOR of St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, Pa., addressed the following letter to Ambassador Oumansky, representing Russia at Washington:

"My dear Mr. Oumansky:

"This may be a bit startling — nevertheless, I hereby cordially invite you to address my congregation, composed chiefly of working people, on Sunday, August 31, 1941, at 11 A. M. This will be on the Sunday before Labor Day.

"You may ask why a godless Communist should be invited to speak in a Christian church. The answer is very simple. Soviet Russia, whose Ambassador you are in the United States, is now at war with foul Adolf Hitler and his equally foul Nazi armies. Christian democracy, American and British, is determined to wipe the stain of Hitlerism off the face of the earth. Soviet Russia, godless and blackhearted, has become a more or less unexpected and an unwelcome associate of democracy in the grim task of destroying Hitler.

"Many of us, as Christians, would like to see the United States give the Soviet every possible aid. We are ready, as Christians, to forgive Joe Stalin and all the rest of you for all your past sins.

"IF, by the full authority of the Moscow government, you can stand in my church on August 31, announce that your government has adopted the policy of universal freedom of worship, announce the abolition of all your atheistic agencies, invite Christian missionaries to come to Russia, then we shall pray for Russian victory and shall strongly advocate every possible American aid to your country.

"If however, you are not able, in the name of Moscow, to announce the establishment of these basic Christian and democratic freedoms, we shall oppose aid to Russia with all our might — we shall pray for utter destruction of Russia by Hitler, but only after bitter and exhausting battle. Then, with the godless Russian Bear dead, we shall the more easily be able to destroy the wounded and weakened Nazi jackal. And with both Communism and Naziism in hell, men will once again be free.

"Of course, if you are unable, in the name of your government, to announce religious freedom in Russia, my invitation to you is automatically withdrawn. If Russia is to continue godless and anti-God, I would rather invite a pig than the Russian Ambassador. I can get good ham and bacon from a pig. Can any good at all be had from a godless Communist?

"Awaiting your reply with considerable interest, I am

"Sincerely yours,

"DAVID C. COLONY, Rector,
"St. Luke's Episcopal Church."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Defense Program in a Mess

TO FIGHT, or not to fight, is not the question.

Granting that we do get into a shooting war, who will lead us to victory, or defeat?

According to U. S. Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia, Democratic spokesman, here is the record of our national defense program up to date – a record not compiled by critics of the New Deal, not by political opponents of F.D.R., by "pro-Nazis" or "anti-Semites"; but a record compiled by the New Deal itself:

Tanks: **"After two years, our tank production up-to-date is practically negligible."**

Antiaircraft Guns: **"Today, all of the antiaircraft guns of modern design we have could not protect effectively a single city in the United States. In this vital weapon our two-year production has been negligible?**

The Navy: **"We need desperately a two-ocean Navy of at least 700 major vessels . . . This we will not have until 1946, five years hence, unless extraordinary means are adopted to speed production."**

Merchant Ships: **"Production in 1941 is hardly more than the gross sinkings by the Germans in one of the heaviest casualty months. This number (105) is woefully short of the need, and immediate steps must be taken to speed this production up."**

Planes: **"The state of production of combat planes declined below the production established in May. In the month of July a still more serious reduction occurred.**

"In long range bombers so desperately needed, production now does not exceed 60 per month. Only 35 dive bombers were produced in May."

Other Equipment: **"The first 105 mm. howitzer was produced on May 7, last, and only about 100 will be produced this calendar year. Thirty-seven mm. antitank guns will be produced only at the rate of 15 a month. Only 15 of the 80 mm. mortars will be produced in the immediate months ahead. Not a single 155 mm. gun will be produced in 1941."**

The above record is publicized officially by Senator Byrd for the consideration of the American people.

It is a record which should frighten any person possessing an ounce of brains.

More than $10-billion has been spent on this national defense – and we can not defend one American city.

The taxpayers have been generous and uncomplaining. But, as citizens, they are beginning to ask themselves: "Can money win the war, if a shooting war comes?"

The answer is a definite, categorical "No."

We need leadership to win a war.

And leadership, as Mr. Roosevelt has proven, is not found inside the New Deal camp.

God help America if we get into a shooting war under the direction of F.D.R.!

We are headed for certain defeat, if the past record, as disclosed by Senator Byrd, is any prevision of our future accomplishments.

Rep. Voorhis Tells Congress About Money—
See Page 14

PITTSBURGH PA
342
Z-4

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED